United Nations A/51/PV.79

General Assembly
Fifty-first Session

Official Records

79th plenary meeting
Tuesday, 10 December 1996, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Razali Ismail . . . . . (Malaysia)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Minoves-Triquell (Andorra), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Reports of the First Committee

The Acting President: The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the First Committee on agenda items 60, 61, 63 to 81 and 62.

I request the Rapporteur of the First Committee, Mr. Parfait Serge Onanga-Anyanga of Gabon, to introduce the reports of the First Committee in one intervention.

Mr. Onanga-Anyanga (Gabon), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from French*): It is partly thanks to the far-sightedness of the President of the General Assembly that we are meeting here today to take up the reports of the First Committee. All those who, like myself, had the privilege of participating in the various meetings of the expanded Bureau of the General Assembly, over which he presided, have been able to see his keen interest in all the items on the General Assembly's agenda. We have also seen how much he values respect for the timetable for the work of each Committee.

It was in this particularly encouraging atmosphere that Ambassador Sychou of Belarus, Chairman of the First Committee, so successfully guided the work of that important body. I now have the honour and the pleasure of introducing to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee under agenda items 60 to 81 of the General Assembly, which were assigned to the First Committee. These reports are contained in documents A/51/566, A/51/566/Adds.1 to 21 and A/51/567.

Before introducing the reports, I would like to say a few words on their format.

As the Bureau of the Committee has already indicated to the President, a special effort has been made at this session to try to offer a more rational presentation of the reports of the First Committee. In a note dated 20 November 1996, I informed the members of Committee that the changes that had been introduced were designed to avoid the repetition of the first four introductory paragraphs.

I also underlined that the general effect of this measure would be to make the reports easier to use and would greatly reduce the number of pages, which is particularly important during this period of grave financial crisis in our Organization.

I appreciate the favourable reception given by delegations to the innovations I proposed to them, and I am particularly grateful to those delegations that submitted their comments to me.

The reports of the First Committee for the current session are therefore more standardized. Each report has a sort of preface, covering all the agenda items assigned to the First Committee — namely, items 60 to 81. There

96-87040 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

is then a brief four-paragraph introduction to each report that serves as a chapeau, it being understood that each item is the subject of an individual report attached to the main report as an addendum. In addition to mentioning when the General Assembly decided on the items to be included in the agenda of the First Committee, the introduction also contains the programme of work, the list of documents considered in the course of the Committee's work and the documents containing the final decisions of the Committee on each item.

The work of the Committee during the fifty-first session of the General Assembly reflects the new atmosphere of overall harmonization in the international arena, the impact of which has been particularly helpful for negotiations in the areas of disarmament and the promotion of international security.

The Committee considered 48 draft resolutions, two draft decisions and a number of amendments to the draft resolutions during the current session. By the end of its work the Committee had adopted 46 draft resolutions, 22 of them by consensus; thus, 45 per cent of the draft resolutions were adopted by consensus. If we add to this all the draft resolutions that were adopted by a large majority, with at least 100 votes in favour, we can say that a total of 40 draft resolutions — 89 per cent — enjoyed broad support in the Committee.

The two draft decisions submitted to the Committee were also adopted.

Following consultations, the authors of two draft resolutions felt that it was not advisable to submit them to the Committee for a decision.

Although the figures do not express all the nuances and controversy inherent in disarmament negotiations, they clearly reflect a consensus on the need to strengthen the process of general and complete disarmament.

There are of course still major obstacles as to the ways and means of attaining this ultimate goal. Even in the absence of sharp ideological differences, such as those that prevailed during the cold-war era, national security aspirations could slow future progress in the area of disarmament.

If this were to come about, it would no doubt nullify the commendable efforts already made, which led to very encouraging results this year, the most outstanding of which are the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa through the adoption of the Pelindaba Treaty at Cairo, the recent signing of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the depositing of the instruments of ratification of the sixty-fifth State party to the Chemical Weapons Convention, which will enter into force in April 1997.

The general debate was held from 14 to 24 October on all the agenda items of the First Committee on disarmament and international security. Ninety-four delegations participated in the general debate. In their statements, delegations welcomed the progress made and stressed the actions and initiatives that should be taken to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and to speed up the disarmament process in all its aspects. In that connection, we should note that items on disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are still the focus of concern of the international community.

Issues relating to a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban, nuclear-weapon-free zones, a halt to the production of fissile material for military purposes, nuclear non-proliferation, weapons of mass destruction and their manufacture and conventional weapons are still by far the most important. Twenty-five of the 48 draft resolutions taken up in the Committee dealt with these items.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty was undoubtedly the most outstanding achievement of the session. Despite its inadequacies, delegations were in general of the view that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty was a significant achievement in the area of nuclear non-proliferation. Signed by 135 States in record time, the Treaty embodies the aspirations of the international community to never again see a single nuclear explosion, even for experimental purposes.

It was also recognized that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons not only reflect the commitment of the international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons but are also important pillars for strengthening non-proliferation regimes as a whole. Many delegations, however, regretted the fact that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty continues to allow for qualitative improvements in nuclear weapons.

Many delegations emphasized the urgent need to take advantage of the great opportunity available in the current international atmosphere and move ahead in the area of nuclear disarmament, in particular. However, it

should be noted that there is currently no consensus on the approach to be taken to attain that objective. Should the focus continue to be only on bilateral negotiations, or should we concentrate on multilateral negotiations in accordance with a clearly established timetable for the total elimination of nuclear weapons with strict international verification? Those two questions show us where we are in the debate and will determine the action to be taken in this area.

It is to be hoped that negotiations on complete nuclear disarmament will continue in 1997 in the Conference on Disarmament. Delegations also expressed a keen desire for continuing negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the production of fissile materials for military purposes. It is generally recognized that such an instrument would strengthen the nuclear-non-proliferation regime.

The establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones and the strengthening of those already existing were the focus of particular attention by the Committee. Draft resolutions on denuclearization of the southern hemisphere and adjacent regions, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, the strengthening of the regime established under the Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean and a treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region were all widely supported by delegations.

Confirming the urgent need for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality or illegality of the threat of use of nuclear weapons was seen by a majority of delegations as a major event. The draft resolution on this item was widely supported, which confirms the importance of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice.

We must now hope that the Court's decision will have a positive impact on future negotiations on nuclear disarmament, such as in the Review Conference of the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the year 2000. The first session of the Preparatory Committee for that Conference is scheduled for 7 to 18 April 1997 at New York, as decided by the Committee. Several delegations expressed the hope that that Conference would provide a framework for the in-depth study of many issues, such as the still pending legal granting of negative security guarantees by nuclear States to non-nuclear States.

Another important event on the international community's disarmament agenda will be the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is particularly encouraging to see that the adoption of the draft resolution in the Committee on this matter was almost unanimous. If all delegations continue to show the same goodwill, we can hope for a consensus decision on this important item at the upcoming meetings of the Disarmament Commission.

The particular feature of the items on the agenda of the First Committee is that, in one way or another, they affect the lives of thousands of people. That is true in the case of questions relating to nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction, and also, particularly in recent times, of questions relating to conventional weapons. In this sensitive area, transparency in international transfers of conventional weapons is essential. The Committee reaffirmed this principle and emphasized the importance of the good conduct and improvement of the Register of Conventional Arms. Several delegations reiterated the need to expand the Register so that it would better respond to reality.

It is especially gratifying to note that seven of the nine draft resolutions on weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons were adopted by consensus. The spirit of dialogue and cooperation demonstrated by delegations enabled the Committee to adopt without a vote one draft resolution, rather than two, on the state of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction.

Another item before the Committee is the issue of anti-personnel mines, which several delegations have unhesitatingly described as weapons of mass destruction. In welcoming the adoption on 3 May 1996 of the revised Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and other Devices, or Protocol II, which prohibits all undetectable mines that do not self-destruct, a majority of delegations regretted that the Protocol had not gone further and consequently came out in favour of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines, calling urgently for the conclusion of a treaty on a total ban on these weapons. Of all the draft resolutions before the Committee, this one had the largest number of sponsors and was adopted in the Committee by a large majority.

Pending conclusion of an international agreement banning the use, stockpiling, manufacture and transfer of

anti-personnel mines, the Committee encouraged all States to continue to observe their unilateral moratoriums on these weapons and called on all other States concerned to take similar measures.

The Committee deeply appreciated the efforts of the Secretary-General in the area of mine clearance and called for a strengthening of the action of the international community in this area and of the assistance to victims of the blind and intolerable violence of anti-personnel mines. Because of the devastating impact of these horrible weapons, several delegations called for priority to be given to the humanitarian aspects in dealing with this sensitive question.

The proliferation of anti-personnel mines and all other conventional weapons, particularly small arms, poses a great threat to international peace and security. The adoption at the last substantive meeting of the Disarmament Commission of the "Guidelines for international arms transfers in the context of General Assembly resolution 46/36 H of 6 December 1991" was welcomed by the Committee because of its potential for combating illicit trafficking in conventional arms.

Here it is encouraging to see that the Committee adopted three draft resolutions by consensus on disarmament and non-proliferation of conventional weapons: measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms; assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them; and consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures. All of these draft resolutions have a direct impact on disarmament at the regional level, on which the Committee rightly focused, *inter alia*, by adopting draft resolutions on regional disarmament and on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels.

The adoption without a vote of all the draft resolutions on the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Latin America and the Caribbean, in Asia and the Pacific and in Africa confirms the Committee's interest in regional disarmament.

This year once again, the Committee also adopted by consensus a draft resolution on regional confidence-building measures to show its support for efforts of the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa in order to promote peace and to consolidate security at the subregional level.

Directly related to the threat to peace and international security posed by the violent disintegration of States, the Committee adopted a draft resolution whereby the General Assembly would call upon Member States to take measures to prevent the occurrence of that phenomenon.

As members know, the Committee considered all the items submitted to it and took decisions on every one. The details of these decisions are contained in the various reports now before the General Assembly.

This applies also to agenda item 62, entitled "Question of Antarctica". Once again, the Committee adopted by consensus the one draft resolution on this item, thereby complying with our good tradition of several years' standing, of adopting important resolutions without a vote. Statements made at our debates reflected the unanimous belief that, in the interests of the human race, Antarctica must remain a zone of peace, where the environment is protected and scientific research can be carried out freely. The draft resolution takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and the role of the United Nations Environment Programme through, *inter alia*, the participation of its Executive Director in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings.

I would now like to comment briefly on the report of the First Committee and to mention a few technical corrections which should be made. I refer to document A/51/566/Add.13 on item 73. In paragraph 2, the second line should read in part: "Conference on Disarmament", not "Committee on Disarmament". I invite delegations to take note of this correction.

Before concluding, I would like to pay tribute to all delegations that participated in the work of the Committee. They demonstrated a praiseworthy spirit of cooperation in our common search for ways and means of building a safer and more stable world.

In particular, I would like to thank the Chairman of our Committee, His Excellency Mr. Alyaksandr Sychou, for his wise advice to me. He presided over the work of the Committee very ably, thanks to his thorough knowledge of issues relating to disarmament and international security and to his skills as an experienced diplomat. I should also like to thank the Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, Ambassador García of Colombia and Ambassador Mernier of Belgium, who discharged their functions most efficiently.

My thanks also go to the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Marrack Goulding, for his valuable input to the Committee's work and to thank the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, who so brilliantly directs the Secretariat staff serving our Committee.

In particular, I would like to thank the Secretary of the First Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, whose extensive experience and great competence were a major factor in the success of the Committee's work.

Lastly, I would like to thank Mr. Mohammed Sattar, Mr. Timur Alasaniya and the other staff members of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs for the invaluable assistance which they provided to our Committee at this session.

The Acting President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the First Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that, under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that:

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I remind delegations that, also in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the First Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the First Committee, unless notified otherwise in advance. This means that, where recorded or separate votes were taken in the Committee, we will do the same.

I would also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the First Committee.

The Assembly will first consider Part I of the report of the First Committee contained in document A/51/566 concerning agenda items 60, 61 and 63 to 81.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of Part I of the report of the First Committee?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 60

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

Report of the First Committee (Part II) (A/51/566/Add.1)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part II of its report (A/51/566/Add.1).

The draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/37).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 60?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 61

Reduction of military budgets

(a) Reduction of military budgets

(b) Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures

Report of the First Committee (Part III) (A/51/566/Add.2)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part III of its report (A/51/566/Add.2).

The draft resolution, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", was adopted by the First Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/38).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 61?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 63

The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament

Report of the First Committee (Part IV) (A/51/566/Add.3)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 5 of Part IV of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uruguay

The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to 39, with 24 abstentions (resolution 51/39).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Germany informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 63?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 64

The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields

Report of the First Committee (Part V) (A/51/566/Add.4)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part V of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Sri Lanka, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 161 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 51/40).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 64?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 65

Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water

Report of the First Committee (Part VI) (A/51/566/Add.5)

The Acting President: In paragraph 2 of Part VI of its report, the First Committee informs the Assembly that no action was taken by the Committee under agenda item 65.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to take note of Part VI of the report of the First Committee and to conclude its consideration of agenda item 65?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 66

Implementation of the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty

Report of the First Committee (Part VII) (A/51/566/Add.6)

The Acting President: In paragraph 2 of Part VII of its report, the First Committee informs the Assembly that no action was taken by the Committee under agenda item 66.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to take note of Part VII of the report of the First Committee and to conclude its consideration of agenda item 66?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 67

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East

Report of the First Committee (Part VIII) (A/51/566/Add.7)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of Part VIII of its report.

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/41).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 68

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia

Report of the First Committee (Part IX) (A/51/566/Add.8)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part IX of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining:
Afghanistan, Algeria, Cuba, Cyprus, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Viet Nam

The draft resolution was adopted by 156 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions (resolution 51/42).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 69

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons

Report of the First Committee (A/51/566/Add.9)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of part X of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 45 abstentions (resolution 51/43).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 69?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 70

Prevention of an arms race in outer space

Report of the First Committee (A/51/566/Add.10)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 5 of part XI of its report.

Separate votes have been requested on the seventeenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6.

Is there any objection to those requests?

There is no objection.

I shall therefore put to the vote first the seventeenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan

The seventeenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 117 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.

The Acting President: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Uzbekistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 44 abstentions (resolution 51/44).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 70?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 71

General and complete disarmament

Report of the First Committee (A/51/566/Add.11)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it 20 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 63 of part XII of its report and one draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 64 of part XII of the same report.

I now call on the representative of Canada, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote or position before voting.

Mr. Fowler (Canada): My explanation of vote pertains to the draft resolution entitled "The nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

Canada is a firm believer in the value to enhanced international peace and security of nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties freely arrived at by the States involved with clear respect for international law. This is a draft resolution that Canada would have preferred to support, and this was made known to the sponsors during our consultations as the draft resolution evolved.

Given, however, that certain of our concerns were not addressed in the text as finally presented, we voted against this draft resolution in the First Committee. Subsequently we have had several discussions with many of the principal sponsors of the draft resolution. They have assured us that our substantive concerns can be addressed through appropriate interpretation of the draft resolution. As our concerns have been considerably, but not completely, alleviated by these assurances and associated discussions, we have decided to move to an abstention on this draft resolution.

The Acting President: I shall put the 20 draft resolutions and the one draft decision to the Assembly one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their vote.

The 20 draft resolutions, which are identified by the letters A to T, are contained in paragraph 63 of section III of the report, entitled "Recommendations of the First Committee".

Will delegations please turn to paragraph 63 of section III now.

We shall turn first to draft resolution A, entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Israel

Draft resolution A was adopted by 167 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 51/45 A).

The Acting President: Draft resolution B is entitled "The nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3.

Is there any objection to that request?

There is no objection.

I shall therefore put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 46 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Jamaica informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Thailand had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: I now put to the vote draft resolution B as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United

Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution B as a whole was adopted by 129 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions (resolution 51/45 B).

The Acting President: Draft resolution C is entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Denmark, Latvia, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution C was adopted by 163 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions (resolution 51/45 C).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Denmark, Latvia, Seychelles and Tajikistan informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution D is entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution D without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 51/45 D).

The Acting President: Draft resolution E is entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution E was adopted by 137 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions (resolution 51/45 E).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Latvia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution F is entitled "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution F without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 51/45 F).

The Acting President: Draft resolution G is entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons".

Separate votes have been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1.

Are there any objections to those requests?

There are none.

I shall therefore put to the vote first the seventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
India

Abstaining:
Cuba, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 161 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
India, Israel, Nepal

Abstaining:
Brazil, Cuba

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 161 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nepal informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour].

The Acting President: I now put to the vote draft resolution G as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire,

Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, Brazil, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nigeria

Draft resolution G as a whole was adopted by 159 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 51/45 G).

The Acting President: Draft resolution H is entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 5.

Are there any objections to those requests?

There are none.

I shall therefore put to the vote first operative paragraph 3 (b).

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 3 (b) was adopted by 147 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 146 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution H as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri

Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution H as a whole was adopted by 154 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 51/45 H).

The Acting President: Draft resolution I is entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:
Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Croatia, Cyprus, Ireland, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution I was adopted by 107 votes to 37, with 24 abstentions (resolution 51/45 I).

The Acting President: Draft resolution J is entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes."

The First Committee adopted draft resolution J without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution J was adopted (resolution 51/45 J).

The Acting President: Draft resolution K is entitled "Regional disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia,

Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
India

Draft resolution K was adopted by 170 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 51/45 K).

The Acting President: Draft resolution L is entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution L without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution L was adopted (resolution 51/45 L).

The Acting President: Draft resolution M is entitled "Advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 3 and 4.

Is there any objection to that request?

There is no objection.

I shall therefore put to the vote first operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius,

Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Latvia, Monaco, Romania, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Israel, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 139 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sweden, Tajikistan, Togo, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 110 votes to 27, with 29 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution M as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica,

Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Tajikistan, Togo, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution M as a whole was adopted by 115 votes to 22, with 32 abstentions (resolution 51/45 M).

The Acting President: Draft resolution N is entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution N without a vote.

May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution N was adopted (resolution 51/45 N).

The Acting President: Draft resolution O is entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution O was adopted by 110 votes to 39, with 20 abstentions (resolution 51/45 O).

The Acting President: Draft resolution P is entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, Israel, Kazakstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, United States of America

Draft resolution P was adopted by 165 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 51/45 P).

The Acting President: Draft resolution Q is entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
India

Abstaining:
Cuba, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Draft resolution Q was adopted by 164 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 51/45 Q).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Bahrain informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution R is entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution R was adopted by 160 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 51/45 R).

The Acting President: Draft resolution S is entitled "An international agreement to ban anti-personnel landmines".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Israel, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey

Draft resolution S was adopted by 155 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 51/45 S).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Bangladesh and Belgium informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution T is entitled "Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution T without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/45 T).

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 64 of part XII of its report.

The draft decision is entitled "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint

Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

The draft decision was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 52 abstentions.

The Acting President: I now call on the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea abstained in the voting on the resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons" (51/45 G), which was originally put forward by Japan, for the same reason that it did so last year.

As many delegations clearly said in the First Committee, the title and the contents of the resolution are not in accord. The resolution does not clarify anything as to how ultimately to eliminate nuclear weapons. The discrepancy represents Japan's double-dealing tactics on nuclear-weapon issues.

Japan is trying very hard to give the world the impression that it is opposed to nuclear weapons by talking a lot about its horrendous experience of nuclear attack. However, the contrary is the case. Japan is the only country that is accumulating large quantities of plutonium, in disregard of the denunciation of the world's peace-loving peoples.

Japan has made no settlement for the war crimes it committed in the past. Without a doubt, Japan now has the ulterior objective in the resolution of covering up its real intention of nuclear armament. We are afraid that the resolution may mislead the world public.

The Acting President: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and five minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Takahashi (Japan): The allegation made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was nothing but a malicious exercise in anti-Japanese propaganda. While I do not wish to argue against specific allegations made in his statement, I should like to make the following statement.

Japan has made it clear that it is determined to conduct a proactive foreign policy that will enable it to contribute to the future well-being of mankind. Japan pursues this policy in a spirit of international cooperation and in keeping with its Constitution, which prohibits the use of force as a means of resolving international conflicts. Remorseful of the suffering brought about by the Second World War on its neighbouring countries, Japan has expressed on many occasions its determination to see that such a tragedy is never repeated.

Japan is committed to forging relations based on mutual trust and confidence with the countries of Asia, the Pacific and the rest of the world. Furthermore, Japan strictly upholds its three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, producing or introducing into its territory nuclear weapons. That Japan would develop and possess nuclear weapons is inconceivable.

In introducing the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, Japan was sincerely motivated. Japan was very glad to see the resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority. My delegation calls upon the

delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in a more positive manner in the deliberations of the United Nations.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My statement made in explanation of position was based on the facts. Japan has not settled the issue of crimes committed during the Second World War. Japan is now accumulating plutonium; it is buying plutonium from world producers. The Japanese Diet is discussing the fact that it is not going to apologize for war crimes. That means that Japan will again commit crimes against humanity. That is our concern.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 71?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 72

Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly

Report of the First Committee (Part XIII) (A/51/566/Add.12)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it six draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 19 of Part XIII of its report (A/51/566/Add.12).

I shall now put the six draft resolutions to the Assembly for action one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their vote.

We turn first to draft resolution A, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: United Nations Disarmament Information Programme".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution A without a vote. May I consider it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 51/46 A).

The Acting President: Draft resolution B is entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 51/46 B).

The Acting President: Draft resolution C is entitled "Regional confidence-building measures".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution C without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 51/46 C).

The Acting President: Draft resolution D is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone,

Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Comoros, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Georgia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sweden, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Draft resolution D was adopted by 114 votes to 31, with 27 abstentions (resolution 51/46 D).

The Acting President: Draft resolution E is entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution E without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution E was adopted (resolution 51/46 E).

The Acting President: Draft resolution F is entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution F without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution F was adopted (resolution 51/46 F).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 72?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 73

Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session

Report of the First Committee (Part XIV) (A/51/566/Add.13)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 10 of Part XIV of its report (A/51/566/Add.13).

We shall turn first to draft resolution A, entitled "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall

Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Turkey, United States of America

Draft resolution A was adopted by 171 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions (resolution 51/47 A).

The Acting President: Draft resolution B is entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 51/47 B).

The Acting President: Draft resolution C is entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution C without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 51/47 C).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 73?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 74

The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East

Report of the First Committee (Part XV) (A/51/566/Add.14)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 6 of Part XV of its report (A/51/566/Add.14).

A separate vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph. Is there any objection to that request?

There is no objection.

I shall therefore put to the vote first the sixth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea,

Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Guatemala, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nicaragua, Pakistan

The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 155 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The Acting President: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Guatemala, India, Kazakstan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Singapore, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela

The draft resolution was adopted by 129 votes to 3, with 32 abstentions (resolution 51/48).

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 74?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 75

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects

Report of the First Committee (Part XVI) (A/51/566/Add.15)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part XVI of its report (A/51/566/Add.15).

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects", without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/49).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 75?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 76

Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region

Report of the First Committee (Part XVII) (A/51/566/Add.16)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part XVII of its report (A/51/566/Add.16).

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/50).

Agenda item 77

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

Report of the First Committee (Part XVIII) (A/51/566/Add.17 and Corr.1)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part XVIII of its report (A/51/566/Add.17).

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to 3, with 37 abstentions (resolution 51/51).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 77?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 78

Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

Report of the First Committee (Part XIX) (A/51/566/Add.18)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 4 of Part XIX of its report (A/51/566/Add.18).

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/52).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 78?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 79

African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty

Report of the First Committee (Part XX) (A/51/566/Add.19)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 5 of Part XX of its report (A/51/566/Add.19).

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba)", without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/53).

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to conclude its consideration of agenda item 79?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 80

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction

Report of the First Committee (Part XXI) (A/51/566/Add.20)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 5 of Part XXI of its report (A/51/566/Add.20).

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/54).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 80?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 81

Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security

Report of the First Committee (Part XXII) (A/51/566/Add.21)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of Part XXII of its report and on the draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of the same report.

We turn first to the draft resolution entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States", contained in paragraph 7 of the report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, China, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Pakistan, United Republic of Tanzania

The draft resolution was adopted by 162 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 51/55).

The Acting President: We turn now to the draft decision entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", contained in paragraph 8 of Part XXII of the report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

The draft decision was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 53 abstentions.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 81?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 62

Question of Antarctica

Report of the First Committee (A/51/567)

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report (A/51/567).

The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 51/56).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 62?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the First Committee.

Programme of work

The Acting President: I should like to inform members that, on Thursday, 12 December, in the morning, in addition to agenda item 38, "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe", the Assembly will consider agenda item 7, "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations"; agenda items 21 (b), "Special economic assistance to individual countries or regions" and 21 (d), "Assistance to the Palestinian people", for the purpose of considering draft resolutions submitted under the two sub-items; agenda item 42, "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity", for the purpose of considering the draft resolution submitted under this item; agenda item 51, "Declaration of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity on the aerial and naval military attack against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya by the present United States Administration in April 1986"; agenda item 52, "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security"; agenda item 53, "Consequences of the Iraqi occupation of and aggression against Kuwait"; agenda item 54, "Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations"; agenda item 57, "Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte"; as well as three reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 153, "Financing of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina", agenda item 154, "Financing of the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium", and agenda item 155, "Financing of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force".

On Friday, 13 December, in the afternoon, the Assembly will consider agenda item 161, "Cooperation between the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration"; agenda item 34, "Assistance in mine clearance", for the purpose of considering the draft resolution submitted under agenda item 21 (c), "Emergency international assistance for peace, normalcy and reconstruction of war-stricken Afghanistan", together with agenda item 39, "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security" and agenda item 56, "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina".

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

United Nations A/51/PV.80

General Assembly
Fifty-first Session

Official Records

80th plenary meeting
Wednesday, 11 December 1996, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Razali Ismail ..... (Malaysia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 98 *(continued)*

Operational activities for development

Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the operations of the United Nations Children's Fund

The President: This afternoon the General Assembly, in accordance with the decisions taken at its 3rd and 70th plenary meetings, is holding a plenary meeting devoted to the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the operations of the United Nations Children's Fund, under agenda item 98, entitled "Operational activities for development".

The fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) deservedly should be an occasion to take stock of and recognize the many achievements of the Organization. We also need to remember the dedication and selfless service of stalwarts like the late James Grant to the cause of UNICEF. At a time when much of the United Nations is under negative scrutiny, UNICEF has many successes to relate, about changing attitudes, prospects and lives of children.

The protection and welfare of children all over the world, beyond politics and selectivity, must be the continuing purpose of UNICEF. Children are our future. All decisions that we make have an impact on them in some way. Children touch us in many ways that can heal divisions between individuals and between groups and help to build bridges between countries. The instinct to protect and nurture them runs deep in all societies.

It will be a strong indictment of societies and Governments if children continue to be betrayed, the bloom of their promise blighted, their full potentials unmet. We cannot in all conscience maintain that we have done everything within our power to protect the most basic of children's rights — the right to life — if millions of children are being killed violently, face bleak prospects, are conscripted into wars and become victims of endless terror.

If children are to meet their full potential, society must provide them the best chance by fully investing in their education and by inculcating the values of tolerance and pluralism. Resources, including financial resources, must be mobilized in the promotion of the necessary programmes and activities to this end. We must continue to agitate for greater expenditure on education and health care for our young, rather than increased outlay on military weapons. It is distressing to realize that when it comes to the crunch, Governments are more concerned about supporting the rights of buying and selling arms than about protecting the rights of people, including children, to live free from armed conflicts and violence.

UNICEF has done well in identifying and mobilizing resources. However, in a world of depleting resources and the drying up of humanitarian impulses, serious questions arise as to how to resolve the question

96-87052 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

of different institutions competing for contracting resources. While UNICEF has had resources to make changes to children's health and well-being, the absence of resources to tackle the root causes of poverty and marginalization brings into focus contradictions in terms of global commitments and purposes.

A distressing concern with regard to the state of children today is the issue of the exploitation of children. The use of children as actors, targets and hostages in war and violent conflict is so base in its violation of universal values that our conscience should be provoked to the highest degree of moral outrage. Child labour involving the exploitation of children in desperate situations is highly objectionable. Children in these situations are subject to physical, mental and sexual abuse. The crushing effects of poverty and dire conditions are brought to bear on children as victims.

However, that issue should not be turned into the politicization of the rights of children to be used as a weapon against selected countries. The international community must be honest enough to recognize that poverty and the absence of development, in the context of an unjust world, leave millions of children anguished, maimed and orphaned in poor countries. For as long as the inequities between those that have and those that have not are perpetuated, pontifications of goodwill solve precious little.

I believe the international community can find the compassion and tenacity required to protect children all over the world. This requires the sacrifice of time, energy and commercial profit. It also requires a dispassionate acceptance of a global commitment to overcome poverty and marginalization. We must deal with the crisis of our conscience — the disparity between the safety, comfort and numerous material luxuries some children enjoy, and the millions of their contemporaries who face terrible prospects with neither option nor choice.

We are all responsible. We, as parents, adults, Governments and civil society, must play our part in helping make society aware that abuses of children's rights, in whatever form, are unacceptable and cannot be allowed to continue. We must reject the notion that the exploitation of children takes place only in the developing world. It happens all around us. Our lifestyles and the choices we make every day all have an impact on someone, perhaps a child, somewhere.

I now call on the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General: It gives me great pleasure to be a part of this United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) family celebration.

Since 1946, UNICEF has been on the humanitarian front line for children. Its accomplishments are a source of pride that is shared throughout the international community. The fiftieth anniversary of UNICEF offers us a unique opportunity. We can reflect on past progress, we can review lessons learned and we can boldly look forward to the future.

UNICEF and its many partners — Governments, national committees for UNICEF, non-governmental organizations and the public at large — have worked in every region of the world. They have given special attention to developing countries. They have brought astonishing improvements to the lives of millions of children. They have also encouraged political responsibility, defined national and local strategies and priorities, mobilized grass-roots participation, provided technical assistance and promoted the rights of women and children everywhere.

On this anniversary, there is cause to celebrate achievements in health, nutrition, education, water supply and sanitation, as well as in the care of children in crisis. Today, UNICEF remains at the front line of conflict that are more numerous and complex than ever before. To meet changing needs, UNICEF's operations include psychosocial care and the rehabilitation of formal child soldiers and child witnesses to atrocities. The principle of first call for children affirms that the protection and development of children should be given priority at all times. UNICEF has worked and has encouraged others to make this principle a reality.

None of these advances would have been possible without the dedication and talents of the UNICEF staff and the resourceful leadership of four Executive Directors: Maurice Pate, Henri Labouisse, James Grant and Carol Bellamy. Above all, let us never forget the many staff members who have given their lives in the service of children. Tragically, the situation of children in many parts of the world remains critical. Inadequate social and economic conditions turn promise into peril. Armed conflicts, exploitation and intolerance turn hope into hatred.

Last month Graça Machel and a group of experts reported to me on the findings of a two-year-long study on the impact of armed conflict on children. They

described a desolate moral vacuum, in which children are victimized, used as soldiers and poisoned by hate and mistrust. We must break that cycle. If we do not, children will be much more likely to repeat the mistakes of their elders.

Children are the key to a better future, a better world. It is essential that children be offered an opportunity to reach their full potential and contribute to progress and development in their countries. Leaders are beginning to understand that the gross national product (GNP) is just one measure of growth. Nations that protect and invest in their children's potential are the nations that will progress.

What I have found most encouraging in my discussions with world leaders is that common ground can almost always be found when children's interests are at stake. That is evident in the zones of peace that UNICEF has been able to negotiate. It was manifested in the first ever World Summit for Children, convened in 1990, and expressed in the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

UNICEF's leadership, credibility and insistence on zones of peace for the protection of children have paved neutral paths through political and cultural minefields. That has enabled the delivery of vaccines and other essential items to children caught up in war. Since the World Summit for Children, more than 150 countries have drafted national programmes of action. Ninety-eight per cent of the world's children live in countries that are now committed to providing them with adequate resources and services. More than 50 Governments have so far reported to the Committee on the Rights of the Child on the steps they have taken to fulfil their obligation. Fourteen have written provisions of the Convention into their Constitutions. Thirty-five have amended their laws or passed new child-friendly legislation. Some have created special units to monitor violations of children's rights; others have appointed ombudsmen to speak out on behalf of children.

UNICEF continues to provide technical support to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. It was the suffering of children in war that prompted the founding of UNICEF 50 years ago. It is the continuing suffering of children that reminds us how much more we need to do and how important the work of UNICEF is. Let us draw strength from the successes of the past to forge ahead with vigour. Let us bring a better future to the children of the world — our collective future.

The President: I now call on the representative of the Congo, speaking on behalf of the African States.

Mr. Abibi (Congo) *(interpretation from French)*: The commemoration today of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) affords me the great honour of paying warm tribute, on behalf of the States members of the African Group, to an organization whose work lies at the heart of the most noble concerns of mankind. The basic mission entrusted to UNICEF when it was established in 1946, and which its Executive Board reaffirmed last January, is centred on the defence of the rights of children, responding to their needs and providing what they require for their full development.

The work accomplished over these 50 years is tremendous, both legislatively and operationally. The Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is the cornerstone of the legal edifice built by the international community, is a particularly powerful instrument that defends and protects the whole range of fundamental rights of the child, just as it enshrines the actions of States on behalf of children as legal obligations, and not only as acts of charity or compassion.

The mobilization of political will and material resources to help countries to put children first and to formulate the appropriate policies for children better is basic to the work done by UNICEF, the impact of which in African countries is appreciated by all.

We wish to pay tribute here to the significant progress achieved in Africa by UNICEF, notably in combating malnutrition, disease and illiteracy. We welcome in particular the eradication of smallpox and the remarkable fact that since 1980 20 million children have survived thanks to immunizations, oral rehydration therapy and other simple measures.

A well-deserved tribute must be paid also to the staff of UNICEF, who, by making tremendous sacrifices, exploits every day, giving hope to starving, sick children in areas of conflict — the innocent victims of the madness of adults. These women and men, especially those working in Africa, deserve our admiration and deep gratitude.

I wish also to salute the leaders of UNICEF, such as the late James Grant, whose devotion to the world's children has been the catalyst for the salutary work accomplished by UNICEF over the last 50 years.

Despite the significant results achieved over the past five decades, safety nets for children remain very fragile. As "The Progress of Nations" 1996 issue stresses, many battles still need to be fought and won to attain all the objectives set out in the fundamental mission of UNICEF. Too many children still suffer from malnutrition and diseases and fall victim to disasters, armed conflict and absolute poverty. Too many children still are forced to do things that violate their physical and moral integrity and jeopardize their full development. Too many women and girls still are the victims of social, economic, political and cultural marginalization.

In Africa, many countries face economic situations marked by various difficulties such as a heavy debt burden or a lack of financial resources; this undermines efforts to create conditions that are conducive to the harmonious development of children, to which they have a legitimate right.

The commemoration of this anniversary is thus a good opportunity for us to reaffirm our faith in an organization that, on the international level, constitutes the ideal framework for defending the rights of children and for proclaiming the commitment of States to helping it to continue its sustaining work by giving it the resources commensurate with its mission.

These facts show that the international community still needs UNICEF to help ensure that in the twenty-first century childhood can be a time of hope and promise throughout the world — not a time of misery and marginalization.

The President: I now call on the representative of Mongolia, speaking on behalf of the Group of Asian States.

Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia): It gives me great pleasure to speak on behalf of the States members of the Asian Group on the occasion of the golden jubilee of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), which was brought into being initially to help children affected by the Second World War. Over the years, UNICEF has developed into a reliable provider for the needs of all children around the world and a staunch champion of their interests. UNICEF's multifaceted activities have included the massive struggle waged to control the menace of epidemic diseases in the 1950s; efforts to integrate children's needs into the overall development agenda in the 1960s; the commitment to provide basic social services to children in the 1970s; the campaign for child survival and development in the 1980s; and, in the closing decade of this century, efforts to support Governments in ensuring the protection of the rights of children, in particular those in especially difficult circumstances.

One of the most important highlights in UNICEF's history is the 1990 World Summit for Children, held under the inspired leadership of James Grant, which was crowned by the adoption, at the highest political level, of action-oriented comprehensive goals to the year 2000 to ensure the survival, protection and development of children.

It is heartening to note from the mid-decade review that over 90 countries clearly achieved significant progress in the betterment of living standards of children. The most impressive achievements include, *inter alia*, a dramatic expansion of immunization services, which has resulted in the near eradication of poliomyelitis and dracunculiasis (guinea worm disease). One and a half billion more people were provided with iodized salt, thus protecting some 12 million infants from mental retardation. On an annual basis, 7 million lives are saved due to the reduction in under-five mortality, and the drastic improvement in home management of diarrhoea also saves 1 million additional children annually. In 1995 an estimated 50 million more primary school-age children were enrolled in school than had been in 1990.

UNICEF deserves full credit for attaining these targets. Its national and regional offices around the world, in partnership with Governments and all other actors of society, have helped to improve the daily lives of hundreds of thousands of girls and boys. The Asian States take this opportunity to pay tribute to the entire staff of UNICEF, both at headquarters and in the field, for their untiring efforts to ensure a better future for our descendants.

The commemoration of anniversaries provides us with an opportunity not only to congratulate ourselves on our accomplishments, but also to draw on the experiences of the past in order to meet the challenges of the present and the future. Much remains to be done, since children still face major threats to their survival and development, including malnutrition, lack of access to clean water and sanitation, illiteracy, exploitative labour, prostitution, violence and sexual abuse, and above all, becoming the targets and victims of armed conflicts.

Meeting these challenges will require enhanced international cooperation and genuine political will. The growing political will in favour of children is

demonstrated by the fact that the Convention on the Rights of the Child is now almost universally ratified and is being used by Governments as a framework for national programmes for children and cooperation with UNICEF. The targets set at the World Summit for Children and the rights provided in the Convention are indeed twin pillars that complement each other in promoting and guaranteeing the well-being of children.

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate our firm belief that this commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of UNICEF will inspire a renewed commitment on the part of the international community to the cause of children through a redoubling of its efforts to attain the objectives set at the Summit and to ensure a better life for every child throughout the world.

The President: I now call on the representative of Poland, speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States.

Mr. Matuszewski (Poland): It is a great honour for me to speak today, on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, on the occasion of the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the operations of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Such an anniversary brings thoughts about the roots of the idea of establishing a fund for children and the endeavours of many countries aimed at bringing it about. It gives me special pleasure to mention at this point that Eastern European States were among those countries. We were deeply convinced from the very beginning that the problems of children in their full complexity had to be brought to the highest attention of the international community.

The important mission to respond to the emergency needs of children in the aftermath of the Second World War in Europe unified nations from all over the world and resulted in the foundation in 1946, by the United Nations General Assembly, of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. In October 1953 that organization, under the name of the United Nations Children's Fund, became a permanent part of the United Nations system, with a broadened role to respond to the long-term needs of children living in poverty.

Through all the years since its creation, UNICEF has been working in close cooperation with national Governments, other United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations to meet the needs of children, emphasizing the interrelationship between progress, peace and children's well-being. In 1965, UNICEF was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for its approach, its neutrality and the equal respect that it gave to all children, regardless of their national, cultural, religious and ethnic heritage.

Since then, concrete actions to improve the lives of children have been undertaken. As a result, the average life expectancy of a child increased enormously in just three decades. By 1995, almost 80 per cent of children attended schools, and an equal percentage was protected by vaccines. Child mortality rates were reduced by more than half between 1960 and 1995. Steady progress was made towards meeting the goals set by the World Summit for Children, and the international community demonstrated its commitment to children through the nearly universal ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Children have come to be seen as individuals with fundamental human rights that adult society ought to learn to respect.

The leading role of UNICEF in raising the world's awareness and mobilizing its resources in favour of children is unquestioned. In doing so, the Fund is assisted by national committees in industrialized countries, ambassadors for children, celebrities, parliamentarians, politicians and representatives of non-governmental organizations and business communities from all over the world. However, despite all the good work that is being done, many children are still threatened by malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, exploitation and drug abuse. According to the latest statistical data, over 250 million children around the world work. Many of them are at risk from hazardous and exploitative labour. Millions of children suffer as a result of armed conflicts and natural disasters. All these factors require that further work be done by the international community to strengthen safety nets for children. It is our responsibility to ensure children's basic human rights, including their survival, protection, good health, education and freedom of self-expression.

At this commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the operations of UNICEF, I should like, on behalf of the Group of States of Eastern Europe, to pay tribute to the Fund and its broad range of partners for their commitment, dedication and proven professionalism in standing for children's well-being. We are convinced that in the years to come, under the slogan "children first", with a mission statement having been developed, and in a strong partnership with Governments, non-governmental organizations, civil society and international agencies, UNICEF will strive with the same impetus to meet challenges that confront children and

their families. While offering our sincere congratulations to UNICEF, we declare our readiness to continue to take an active part in facilitating the development of the child into a free and independent human being.

The President: I now call on the representative of Mexico, speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean States.

Mr. Tello (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is an honour for me to express, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, our heartfelt recognition for the work of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) throughout the 50 years during which it has fostered the well-being of children around the world. Working to help children and the family is, without doubt, one of the main contributions made by the United Nations. The consistent, resolute and effective role played by the United Nations in this area has led to a better life for millions of girls and boys. Without UNICEF, their future would have been grim and miserable. Very often, the imaginative immunization campaigns promoted by UNICEF have meant the difference between life and death for millions of girls and boys throughout the world. UNICEF has been the driving force and the conscience of the United Nations in dealing with the suffering of children.

One of the keys to UNICEF's success has been its unusual ability to evolve and keep pace with world requirements. Initially created to take care of the tragic situation of children who had fallen victim to atrocities perpetrated during the Second World War, UNICEF later became a permanent fund to meet the needs of a large number of girls and boys who had no access to food and basic health and education services. In 1990, thanks to UNICEF's support and the great vision of the Executive Director at that time, James Grant, a new stage in the history of the agency began. The World Summit for Children, convened by the leaders of six countries, gathered together more than 170 Heads of State and Government, and succeeded in placing the development of children at the centre of national and global agendas by establishing specific, time-limited goals and the proper mechanisms to attain them.

UNICEF's support was an essential element in the successful conclusion of the most comprehensive legal document to protect the rights of children. With UNICEF's support, it has been possible to ensure that the Convention on the Rights of the Child has come close to becoming the first legal instrument on human rights to obtain universal ratification. While retaining its great ability for political and financial mobilization and intensive, joint work with Governments, UNICEF, under the excellent leadership of Ms. Carol Bellamy, and with a renewed mandate, is focusing on supporting Government efforts to settle outstanding issues, consolidate the gains that it has already achieved and work more effectively to meet present and future challenges.

As for Latin America and the Caribbean, we are now fully involved in the adoption of measures to achieve the goals established by the World Summit for Children. We have worked together with UNICEF, achieving startling results in certain important areas, such as child immunization. We are redoubling our efforts to reduce the high rates of child malnutrition and maternal mortality, and to take care of the great needs of girls and boys in particularly difficult circumstances. With the resolute support of UNICEF, we are also focusing our attention on creating national legislation to protect the rights of children, in keeping with the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

A great deal undoubtedly still remains to be done. Despite the efforts of UNICEF, almost 13 million children in developing countries are dying every year due to preventable disease; millions fall victim to the bloodiest armed conflicts and many more to poverty and the plight of being orphaned. This fiftieth anniversary is a unique opportunity to rededicate our hearts and minds, with UNICEF, to continuing our efforts in this common cause and preparing ourselves to resolve problems that still persist.

The Latin American and Caribbean Group would like to reiterate its strong commitment to facing present and future challenges with the most valuable support of this outstanding agency. On behalf of our Governments and the boys and girls of our region, we would like to express our warmest and heart-felt congratulations to the entire UNICEF family on 50 years of tenacity and tireless dedication to the noble cause for which it was created, and that is its *raison d'être*, now and in the future.

The President: I now call on the representative of Canada, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Western European and other States.

Mr. Fowler (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): As Chairman of the Group of Western European and other States, I have the honour of addressing the General Assembly today on the occasion of the fiftieth

anniversary of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). This is a historic event, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to hail an organization that is so important for such a large number of people around the world.

Fifty years ago, the General Assembly transcended political differences to hasten to the aid of children who were so sorely tested by the Second World War. Initially designed as a temporary emergency fund, over the years UNICEF evolved into one of the most important and best known of international organizations. Throughout the world, it brings comfort and hope to children confronting hunger, disease and deprivation. Even more important, UNICEF has managed to place and maintain the problems of children at the top of the international community's agenda. Concrete actions have been taken in order to improve the lives of these children.

(spoke in English)

UNICEF's remarkable successes can be attributed to its many stakeholders, who fervently believe in and support the organization's work. UNICEF's national committees contribute significantly to the organization, and rally many thousands of volunteers to the cause of children worldwide. The private sector and non-governmental organizations are increasingly important partners. The millions of children who participate in the Education for Development initiative are also part of UNICEF. So too are the patrons and recipients of UNICEF's trademark greeting cards, which carry messages of hope, optimism and goodwill throughout the world each year.

The thousands of dedicated employees who have served UNICEF over the years and who continue to perform extraordinary work, often in difficult circumstances, are the heart and soul of UNICEF. Our Governments are vitally important stakeholders, working in partnership with UNICEF offices throughout the world. The many celebrities who have lent their efforts as goodwill ambassadors to support UNICEF's mission are also very much part of UNICEF. Indeed, Roger Moore, Nana Mouskouri and Sharon, Louis and Bram of the Boys Choir of Harlem, among others, have joined us today to celebrate this important event.

People ask whether the United Nations has made a difference. We all know that it has, of course, but in the next breath most of us would point to UNICEF as the most evident example of this reality. The millions of lives saved and children nurtured and educated are but some of the examples of UNICEF's invaluable contribution to making ours a better world.

In all likelihood, there would not be a Convention on the Rights of the Child if it were not for UNICEF. There certainly would not have been a World Summit for Children and its resulting Declaration and Plan of Action if not for the inspirational efforts of UNICEF and its then Executive Director, Jim Grant. UNICEF has made and continues to make an enormous difference. Today as we look back on UNICEF's first 50 years, we can express our pride in its achievements. However, it is also time to look to the future and to the challenges that lie ahead. At this session of the General Assembly, we have had the opportunity to review the implementation of the major goals of the World Summit for Children. We have taken note of the progress achieved, while acknowledging that very much work lies ahead of us. More important, we have renewed our pledge to work with UNICEF and with other relevant bodies towards meeting the worthy goals of the World Summit.

Some day, probably in the far distant future, the world will no longer need an organization such as UNICEF. Preventable childhood diseases will be eradicated and children will no longer starve. Neither will they be abused, exploited or made victims of armed conflict. Families will nurture their children in peace and security. Until that time, however, the world needs UNICEF desperately, and UNICEF needs the international community to do its work. Together we can work to ensure that the future, which rests in our children, can be assured and fostered.

The President: I call now on the representative of the United States of America, the host country.

Mr. Grams (United States of America): My name is Rod Grams. I am a member of the United States Senate, from the State of Minnesota, and I serve on the United States Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. On behalf of the United States delegation, I am delighted to be here today to help commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Children's Fund's (UNICEF). The United States is pleased to be the host country for such a worthwhile organization. To millions of people, especially children, around the world, UNICEF is the leading symbol of the United Nations. This is due to the dedication, vision and tireless efforts of the leadership and the staff of UNICEF, both past and present. This is also due to the cooperative spirit among the many nations involved in UNICEF activities and to

the generosity of the many donors, both large and small, public and private, who have contributed to the cause of the world's children.

I value this opportunity to reflect on UNICEF's accomplishments. The United Nations Children's Fund was founded in 1946 to meet the emergency needs of children in the aftermath of the Second World War. Since then it has provided emergency assistance to children and mothers affected by natural and manmade disasters worldwide. Over the years, UNICEF evolved into a leading development agency, seeking long-term solutions for needy children and mothers around the world. Traditional UNICEF programmes have focused on health, nutrition, education and sanitation. Through immunization, oral rehydration and other activities, millions of children's lives have been saved. UNICEF has come to be seen as the preeminent international advocate on behalf of the world's children, particularly those who are abused, abandoned, exploited or victimized by war and disaster.

The outcome of UNICEF's work is well known: lower child mortality, improved nutrition and health for children and mothers, reduction in disease, improved sanitation, better education for children, and greater overall effectiveness in emergency situations. Relief is being provided and lives are being saved even as we speak here today.

This occasion would not be complete without a tribute to the late Jim Grant for his distinguished service to the United Nations and his extraordinary leadership of UNICEF. As many noted upon his departure in 1995, he was a great man with a singular vision and tremendous heart. He was one of the world's great advocates for children, and on this fiftieth anniversary occasion of the organization that he helped to build, may we remember his life and legacy with gratitude and gladness.

Let me also note that more recently, UNICEF has been a leader in United Nations reform. Management excellence is a top priority at UNICEF, and we would like to acknowledge the accomplishments of the current Executive Director in this regard. Recent initiatives in management, programme planning and organizational structure are helping to forge an even more effective UNICEF, poised to meet the many challenges of the future.

There is still much work to be done to alleviate the terrible conditions of many of the world's children. Even while we celebrate UNICEF's first 50 years, it is reprehensible that children around the world still die every day from preventable causes. We must make the well-being of the world's children a top priority in our international agenda.

As we look ahead, we are confident that UNICEF will take inspiration from its past in confronting the problems of the future. Indeed, we must work together for all children, especially those afflicted by poverty, disease, violence and exploitation. As we have often said, we must learn to put children first — for their own sake and for the world's future. We are coming to the end of one of history's most violent centuries. We must raise our children so that they will do better in the next century than in this one. We must remember that we are raising not just the next generation, but also the parents and grandparents of succeeding generations. We all join hands with UNICEF in its efforts to build a more peaceful and humane civilization on this Earth.

In closing today, I would like to thank all of the staff at UNICEF for their dedication. They are serving a truly noble cause. We all applaud them in their accomplishments, and pledge our support in their continued efforts to improve the lives of children everywhere.

The President: We have heard the last speaker for this plenary meeting devoted to the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the operations of the United Nations Children's Fund.

I have been informed by the Ambassador of Romania that a draft resolution on this commemoration will be submitted for consideration on Monday, 16 December, in the afternoon.

Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to inform delegates that immediately following the adjournment there will be an informal segment devoted to the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the operations of the United Nations Children's Fund.

All are invited to attend.

The meeting rose at 4.05 p.m.

United Nations

A/51/PV.81

General Assembly

Fifty-first Session

Official Records

81st plenary meeting
Thursday, 12 December 1996, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Razali Ismail . . . . . (Malaysia)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 38

Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Report of the Secretary-General (A/51/489 and Add.1)

Draft resolution (A/51/L.52)

Amendment (A/51/L.54)

The President: I call on the representative of Denmark to introduce draft resolution A/51/L.52.

Mr. Kimberg (Denmark): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/51/L.52, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, as well as Switzerland, the current Chairman of the OSCE. In addition to the countries listed in the document, the following countries are sponsoring the draft resolution: Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan and Romania.

The draft resolution acknowledges the increasing contribution of the OSCE to the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security in its region through its activities in early warning and preventive diplomacy. This includes the activities of the High Commissioner for National Minorities, crisis management, arms control and disarmament, post-crisis stabilization and rehabilitation measures, its efforts in supporting the economic dimension and its crucial role in the human dimension.

The continued importance of enhanced coordination and cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE has, according to the draft, a high priority, and the meeting held between the United Nations and the regional and other organizations, on 15 and 16 February 1996, on the Secretary-General's invitation, was important in this context.

The report of the Secretary-General is therefore welcomed, together with progress in common work in the field between the United Nations and the OSCE. The Summit Declaration and the decisions adopted by the Heads of State or Government of the OSCE on 3 December 1996 in Lisbon constitute another important step in this direction.

In the draft the OSCE is commended for the fulfilment of the role assigned to it by the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the decision of the OSCE to continue its engagement is welcomed.

Furthermore, the draft resolution supports the activities of the OSCE aimed at contributing to stability

96-87064 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

and the maintenance of peace and security within its region and stresses the importance of the work done in this respect.

The Secretary-General is therefore requested to continue to explore with the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE possibilities for further enhancement of cooperation and to submit to the General Assembly at its fifty-second session a report on cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE.

Let me conclude by expressing Denmark's sincere appreciation for the excellent work carried out by the Swiss delegation in drafting and negotiating this draft resolution. I would like to add that my Government has followed Switzerland's handling of its responsibilities as Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE with the greatest admiration and respect.

Finally, allow me to express the hope of all the sponsors that this draft resolution will attract broad support and will be adopted by consensus.

The President: I now call on the representative of Azerbaijan to introduce the amendment to draft resolution A/51/L.52 contained in document A/51/L.54.

Mr. Kouliev (Azerbaijan) (*interpretation from Russian*): I would like to take this opportunity to express the position of Azerbaijan on the agenda item under consideration and the reasoning that compelled us to put forward the amendment to the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Denmark.

The Azerbaijani Republic attaches great importance to the multilevel cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Today, in a world of radically changed geopolitical realities, the international community, while rid of the ruinous global confrontation of two systems, is faced with a score of new and equally complex challenges to the security and sovereignty of States. We face aggressive separatism, racism, chauvinism, international terrorism and illegal drug trafficking, to name but a few of these phenomena.

In these circumstances, the effective coordination of efforts and the gradual development of increased cooperation between the United Nations and the European organization are crucial if international peace and stability are to be maintained in the OSCE region.

The General Assembly has on numerous occasions acknowledged the ever increasing contribution of the OSCE in the maintenance of international security in the region, covering the entire area from Vancouver to Vladivostok, giving due credit to the activities of the OSCE in early warning, preventive diplomacy, crisis management, arms control and disarmament and post-crisis stabilization and rehabilitation measures. The first tangible fruits of the effective coordination of efforts by both Organizations in this area can now be seen in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Increasing cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE in two other areas — the protection of human rights and economic cooperation — also deserves every support.

In particular, I would like to mention one of the basic aspects of cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE: interaction between these two organizations with regard to the peaceful settlement of conflicts. In accordance with the informal understanding that there should be a certain division of labour between the two organizations, which the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, referred to in his report (A/51/489), the OSCE continues to play the leading role in the search for a peaceful settlement of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. At the same time, we attach great importance to the work already done to try to settle the conflict by the United Nations, in particular, by the Security Council, which has adopted four resolutions — 822 (1993), 853 (1993), 874 (1993) and 884 (1993) — and seven presidential statements on the issue. Regular briefings by the Co-Chairmen of the OSCE Minsk Conference to the Security Council on progress in the ongoing negotiation process are further proof of the constant attention the United Nations is paying to this conflict. Similarly, in this regard, we applaud the continued readiness of the Secretary-General to provide technical assistance for the OSCE peacekeeping operation in the region of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, which will begin once a political agreement has been reached between the parties.

Azerbaijan has on many occasions reiterated its commitment to the peaceful settlement of the conflict within the framework of the OSCE Minsk process. In this connection, the Head of State, President Heydar Aliyev, said that Azerbaijan will continue to respect the ceasefire that has now been in force for more than two and a half years until a political agreement is concluded between the parties to the conflict.

We set great store by the OSCE Summit, held recently in Lisbon, in terms of settling the conflict. A special paragraph proposed for insertion in the final Summit Declaration by the Chairman-in-Office and Co-Chairmen of the OSCE Minsk Conference contained principles upon which the settlement of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict should be based. These principles include respect for the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and Armenia, the highest degree of self-rule for Nagorny Karabakh within Azerbaijan and guaranteed security for that region and its entire population.

The adoption of such a paragraph would have given a much-needed boost to the negotiation process, which is bogged down and would have brought a comprehensive settlement closer. However, one can only regret that the adoption of the paragraph was blocked by one of the 54 OSCE member States - namely, Armenia, which used its veto.

Nevertheless, I should like to note with satisfaction that the principles for the settlement of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict suggested by the Co-Chairmen of the Minsk Conference and the OSCE Chairman-in-Office were fully supported by 53 OSCE member States. In this connection, the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE made a special statement before the Summit in which he set forth the aforementioned principles, underlined support for those principles by the entire European community and expressed his regret that the decision on the issue had been undermined by the stance taken by Armenia. As was also pointed out by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, that statement is an official document of the OSCE Summit and has been annexed to the Lisbon Summit Declaration. It is also worth mentioning that authoritative statements expressing support for the principles of the settlement were made by the head of the delegation of Ireland, who spoke on behalf of the European Union, by the President of Finland, the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation and other speakers at the Summit.

Allow me to turn now to Azerbaijan's amendment contained in document A/51/L.54 to the draft resolution entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe".

The Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict is one of the basic problems facing the OSCE in the field of peaceful conflict resolution. The activities of the OSCE in this area include, primarily, two OSCE Summits in 1994 and 1996, efforts by the OSCE Chairmen-in-Office from 1992 to date and the efforts by the Co-Chairmen of the OSCE Minsk Conference and the entire Minsk Group, which is directly involved in the negotiation process.

As mentioned before, the United Nations, both in the General Assembly and the Security Council, has also been seized of this matter since 1992, kept a close eye on developments with regard to finding a solution to the problem and made its position on the issue quite clear. Moreover, both the United Nations and the OSCE are purposefully cooperating directly in drawing up and implementing the aforementioned OSCE operation.

All this shows the expediency of including a separate paragraph on the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict in the text of the draft resolution of the General Assembly, as in General Assembly resolution 49/13, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe". I feel I should stress in particular that in language and substance the proposed amendment is not only in conformity with the text of that resolution, it is also a considerably watered down version of it. Last but not least, General Assembly resolution 49/13 of 15 November 1994 was adopted without a vote, by consensus, a consensus that included Armenia.

The territorial integrity of Azerbaijan has been unequivocally confirmed by the international community, *inter alia*, in Security Council resolutions. At the recent OSCE Lisbon Summit, all European States, with the sole exception of Armenia, once again reiterated their adherence to this principle. The delegation of Azerbaijan believes that the General Assembly should not allow a situation in which the destructive stance of one Member State can cause the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of a United Nations Member State to be called into question.

I appeal to all States to treat our position with understanding and to support us in this matter that directly affects the highest national interests of my country.

The President: In accordance with General Assembly decision 50/423 of 18 December 1995, I now give the floor to the observer of Switzerland as the State holding the chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr. Manz (Switzerland) *(interpretation from French)*: I am addressing the Assembly today as representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The office of Chairman of the OSCE is a great honour for Switzerland, and it is proof of its willingness to contribute to the solution of the problems of our day in a spirit of openness and solidarity.

The Secretary-General of the OSCE, His Excellency Ambassador Giancarlo Aragona, will speak at a later stage. In the meantime, allow me to thank the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his excellent report on the cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE, as well as to highlight the most important aspects of OSCE activities in 1996.

The main focus of OSCE activities was on the implementation of the Peace Agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Monitoring the general elections and the preparations for them was the greatest operational challenge faced by the organization. The elections of 14 September were far from perfect, but we should look upon them as a first step on the long road towards democracy and as the first signs of greater political openness and tolerance.

Assistance to the democratic rebuilding of Bosnia and Herzegovina will remain one of the principal items on the OSCE agenda. The highest priority will be accorded to the postponed municipal elections and their preparation. Furthermore, the OSCE will continue to pursue its activities in the area of promoting respect for human rights and regional stability.

In addition to its tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the OSCE has also been able to make a fundamental contribution to the peace process in Chechnya through its Assistance Group in Grozny, whose presence there was authorized by the Russian Federation in April 1995. The OSCE involvement has thus been an expression of the serious interest of the international community in finding a peaceful resolution of that conflict.

The OSCE continued to pursue its activities in preventive diplomacy through the activities of the High Commissioner for National Minorities as well as through its various long-term missions in Tajikistan, Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Latvia and Estonia.

We regret the absence of further progress towards resolving the Nagorny Karabakh conflict, notwithstanding the efforts made. During the Summit of Heads of State and Government at Lisbon on 2 and 3 December, all the participating States, with one exception, supported the principle of territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan and of self-determination for Nagorny Karabakh, allowing it the highest degree of autonomy. These two elements constituted the foundation for a political resolution of the conflict.

The Summit of Heads of State and Government at Lisbon adopted a Declaration in the first stage of the discussions on a common and comprehensive security model for Europe for the twenty-first century. The purpose of this model is to create a common security space free of spheres of influence and dividing lines, covering the OSCE region from Vancouver to Vladivostok. That cooperation in the field of security will be laid down in a future European security charter, which has yet to be drafted.

Switzerland, as Chairman-in-Office, has set as a priority goal the achievement of a rational division of labour and efficient cooperation between international organizations. This is particularly relevant to the United Nations, since the OSCE considers itself to be a regional agreement in accordance with Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. We welcome the fact that the Declaration on the security model confirms the OSCE as the comprehensive organization for consultation, cooperation and joint action and also assigns to it a special role in promoting cooperation and complementarity between international organizations. Switzerland considers that the OSCE, by applying the principle of subsidiarity, will be able to alleviate the burdens on the United Nations. In this context, the chairmanship has maintained close contacts with the Secretary-General. The draft resolution now before the General Assembly for adoption on cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE is a step in the right direction, albeit a modest one.

Speaking as representative of the Swiss chairmanship, I should like to express my gratitude to the Permanent Representatives of the OSCE member States for their fruitful cooperation and to wish Denmark, through its Permanent Representative, success as Chairman-in-Office for the coming year.

Mr. Campbell (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The following

associated countries align themselves with this statement: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. Iceland and Norway have also aligned themselves with this statement.

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Giancarlo Aragona, Secretary-General of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). His presence with us today testifies to the growing and ever closer cooperation that exists between the United Nations and the OSCE. The European Union fully supports the draft resolution contained in document A/51/L.52. It has been sponsored by all the members of the European Union.

In his statement to the second meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations in February of this year, the Secretary-General said that the international community must find ways of using the experience, capacities and resources of universal and regional organizations in as effective and cost-efficient a manner as possible. The European Union believes that the objective to which the Secretary-General referred is a very appropriate description of the nature of the relationship that has developed between the United Nations and the OSCE.

The OSCE, the only pan-European and transatlantic security organization, has become a key forum for the management of the changes that have occurred in Europe over the past seven years. In areas such as early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, the OSCE has developed a range of skills that complement those of the United Nations itself.

The European Union, as a central pillar of integration, stability and prosperity in Europe, has played a leading role in the development of the OSCE. Through its future enlargement, the Union will continue to protect stability and security in Europe. We remain committed to the enhanced political effectiveness of the OSCE and to the strengthening of its operational capability. We support the enhancement of the role of the OSCE as a primary instrument of preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation in the OSCE region. The European Union therefore wishes to reaffirm its support for the work of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities and for the long-term missions.

Strengthening the role of the OSCE in these areas will enable it better to assume its responsibilities as a regional organization in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. Consequently, the reaffirmation and operationalization of the "OSCE First" principle, including the possibility for OSCE States jointly to refer a dispute to the Security Council, notwithstanding the position of the States parties to the dispute, is an approach that is under active consideration. Of particular importance in the relationship between the United Nations and the OSCE is the high level of mutual support that each Organization has provided to the other. In those activities where the OSCE's comparative advantage lies, the OSCE coordinates closely with all other organizations that are engaged in the same mission or operation and, in particular, the United Nations.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina — one area that highlights the intensity and effectiveness of this cooperation — the OSCE has played an important role in various central aspects of the peace process, where its activities in support of the recent elections, in arms control and in human rights monitoring have been essential to the positive developments in those areas. The OSCE, at its Summit in Lisbon on 2 and 3 December, confirmed that it would supervise the preparation and conduct of elections for the municipal governing authorities in 1997, having already decided to extend its Mission's mandate to Bosnia and Herzegovina for 1997. Areas where future actions by the OSCE are envisaged include support for, and monitoring of, human rights as well as democratization and assistance for regional stabilization.

The work accomplished by the OSCE mission in Georgia is another example of the role that both organizations can play in helping to resolve conflict. A programme for the protection and promotion of human rights in Abkhazia is to be carried out in cooperation with the OSCE. The European Union is gravely concerned at the so-called elections held in Abkhazia and in South Ossetia, which have undermined the efforts for a political settlement of these conflicts. We are convinced that the international community should continue to search actively for a comprehensive solution.

The conflict in Nagorny Karabakh, where the United Nations has been providing technical and political support to the OSCE Minsk process, is yet another example of practical cooperation, although,

regrettably, there appears to be little willingness by the parties concerned to conduct meaningful negotiations. Recently, the co-Chairmen of the Minsk process paid a visit to the region, where they held meetings with the Presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia and with the Nagorny Karabakh leader, all of whom reiterated their support for the Minsk process. The European Union deeply regrets that it was not possible to achieve consensus on the inclusion in the Declaration of the Lisbon Summit of the principles outlined by the Chairman-in-Office and the co-Chairmen of the Minsk Conference for the settlement of the Nagorny Karabakh conflict. These principles are: territorial integrity of the Republic of Armenia and the Azerbaijan Republic; legal status of Nagorny Karabakh defined in an agreement based on self-determination that confers on Nagorny Karabakh the highest degree of self-rule within Azerbaijan; and guaranteed security for Nagorny Karabakh and its whole population, including mutual obligations to ensure compliance by all the parties with the provisions of the settlement.

The European Union appeals to the parties to continue the negotiations within the OSCE's Minsk process on the basis of these principles.

We also welcome the implementation of the decisions of the 1994 Budapest ministerial meeting on the relationship between the non-participating Mediterranean States and the OSCE, which has resulted in the intensification of dialogue on issues of common interest and has contributed to the identification of opportunities for cooperation.

The European Union welcomes the conclusions of the OSCE Summit held in Lisbon on 2 and 3 December, which took place at an important time in the development of European security architecture. The Summit Declaration gives substantial direction and impetus to further work on the creation of a common security space that responds to the security concerns of all European States, based on the OSCE's comprehensive, inclusive and indivisible concept of security and on full respect for, and implementation of, OSCE principles and commitments, building on the network of mutually reinforcing institutions.

The Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century will strengthen security and stability in the OSCE region and will aim to provide a framework within which all States, security-related organizations and regional and subregional arrangements can work together in a constructive and mutually reinforcing way.

The human dimension remains a priority focus for OSCE action, as it has been from the beginning of the Helsinki process. Respect for, and the promotion of, human rights, the elimination of all forms of discrimination, and free and independent media are basic requisites for a viable democracy, the consolidation of democratic institutions and developing confidence between the government and the people.

Finally, the European Union expresses its appreciation to the Permanent Representative of the Observer Mission of Switzerland and his delegation for his excellent work as Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, and we look forward to working closely with the incoming Chairman-in-Office, the Permanent Representative of Denmark.

Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine): Consideration of the question of cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) at the current session is taking place at a very important stage for both organizations. This stage is characterized by the formation of a vision of the place and the role of these two organizations within the framework of the comprehensive security model for the twenty-first century currently being developed; by an intensification of the process of determining innovative ways effectively to implement the principles and obligations set forth in the United Nations Charter and in the basic documents of the OSCE; and by the search for new forms of cooperation aimed at finding acceptable formulas for the solution of existing regional problems.

Under these circumstances, the strengthening of coordinated and complex interaction between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) at all levels, as well as the practical implementation of the agreements reached, acquire particular significance.

During the past year the level of cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE has significantly increased. We believe this is the result of the close political contacts established between the current Secretary-General of the United Nations and the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, and the active dialogue

between the relevant structures aimed at settling the important problems of the continent.

The active participation of these organizations in the process of implementation of the humanitarian aspects of the Dayton Agreement could serve as a vivid example of the complementarity and rational division of labour between them. The delegation of Ukraine commends the OSCE's role in preparing and conducting free and democratic elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this regard, it would be appropriate to mention the important role played by Ukraine, which, besides providing observers for the OSCE mission, made a financial contribution to the trust fund for the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina, despite the difficult economic situation.

We also hope that the high level of cooperation reached between the United Nations and the OSCE in the process of implementation of the Dayton Agreement will be maintained during the period of post-conflict peace-building aimed at creating a genuine civil society in that country. In this connection, I would like to emphasize that Ukraine is ready to enhance its participation in United Nations and OSCE activities in this important area.

The delegation of Ukraine welcomes the results of the Lisbon Summit held from 2 to 3 December 1996, in particular the elaboration and adoption of the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century, which reflects the basic principles of cooperation among States aimed at creating a common security space free of dividing lines in the OSCE region.

In our opinion, the security assurances for neutral and non-bloc States, as well as strict observance by all OSCE member States of the obligations under the agreements reached, should be an integral part of such a security architecture in Europe. In this regard the United Nations and the OSCE have an exceptional role to play. We think that it is necessary to establish the practice of convening regular meetings between the official representatives of these organizations, in order to exchange opinions on a future security model for Europe, to divide their responsibilities properly within the framework of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security in the OSCE region, and to elaborate relevant arrangements for coordinating their activities and decision-making.

An objective analysis of the political situation in the OSCE region makes it clear that conflicts are emerging where one of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Helsinki Final Act — the principle of the territorial integrity of States — is violated. The current conflicts in Georgia and Azerbaijan are unequivocal proof of this.

Especially disturbing is the fact that we have recently witnessed an increasing number of precedents wherein the principle of territorial integrity of newly independent States is neglected and irresponsible allegations are made that the principle of inviolability of frontiers is not applicable to those States.

In this connection, I would like to caution unambiguously that neglect of the principles of territorial integrity and the inviolability of frontiers, which form a basis of the comprehensive security system, as well as ungrounded territorial claims to the States of the region, whoever makes them, represent a dangerous precedent that undermines security and stability in Europe.

This is why, in our opinion, the serious consideration of this problem should be a priority issue on the agenda of the United Nations and the OSCE. The time has come to institute a reliable machinery to prevent and suppress any attempts to fuel separatism and to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, now and in the future. We think that the practical implementation of the initiative put forward by the President of Ukraine, Mr. Leonid Kuchma, concerning the necessity to adapt the position of the international community on the phenomenon of separatism to today's realities could greatly contribute to the solution of this problem.

We believe that the coordination of activities aimed at protecting human rights and freedoms, resolving the problem of refugees and displaced persons, as well as settling the urgent problems of migration, should constitute another important element of cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE. It is obvious that a single State could not effectively respond to the long-standing problems that are responsible for the tension and instability in the region. It is therefore necessary to develop actively and further strengthen the cooperation between the relevant structures of the United Nations and the OSCE. The holding of the Regional Conference to Address the Problems of Refugees, Displaced Persons, Other

Forms of Involuntary Displacement and Returnees in the Countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States and Relevant Neighbouring States represents an important step in this direction.

We find it necessary to further the interaction between the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. We also consider it appropriate to explore ways of strengthening contacts between the United Nations and the OSCE with regard to the human dimension.

Finally, I would like to underline that unsolved problems in the European continent, as well as new challenges and threats to regional peace and security, clearly prove that the establishment of a comprehensive security system in Europe is impossible without the active participation of the United Nations, which possesses all the necessary resources, capabilities and experience. That is why enhancing and strengthening the cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE could and should become an important factor in the successful establishment and operation of such a system in a new Europe. Ukraine, for its part, will do its best to make sure that this cooperation further develops and strengthens.

Mrs. Fritsche (Liechtenstein): Since Liechtenstein has been a long-standing supporter of the activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), I should like briefly to share some thoughts with the Assembly on the future role of the OSCE and the potential of enhanced cooperation with the United Nations system.

While the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security lies with the United Nations, and more specifically with the Security Council, recent experience has made it very clear that the OSCE and other regional organizations can make a very useful contribution in this respect and that Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations is worth exploring further. The decision taken by participating States to establish the possibility of jointly referring situations to the Security Council on behalf of the OSCE is an element that gives additional momentum to the cooperation between the two organizations. Liechtenstein supports this enhanced and ever-growing cooperation and has therefore co-sponsored the draft resolution before us.

The comparative advantages of the OSCE lie in the fields of preventive diplomacy, crisis management, conflict prevention and conflict rehabilitation, as well as in its capacity to respond and react quickly and efficiently to crisis situations. The OSCE can certainly play an independent and important role that complements the efforts undertaken by the United Nations in these areas. One of the main fields in which such complementary activities have taken place during the period reflected in the report before us is the implementation of the relevant parts of the Dayton Framework Agreement. These activities, particularly in the areas of monitoring elections and of human rights, have been of crucial importance for positive developments. The supervision of the preparation and the conduct of municipal elections and further support for the monitoring of human rights and democratization, as confirmed at the Lisbon Summit on 2 and 3 December, will ensure the consistency of the OSCE involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Likewise, the activities carried out in Chechnya have contributed considerably to creating a basis for peace and a lasting political solution.

With regard to situations in other areas, progress has been difficult to achieve, and we have noted with particular regret the stalemate in the process conducted by the Minsk Group. Given the increased role of the OSCE in the monitoring of elections, it is of vital importance that the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights focus the human and financial resources available to it to carry out these monitoring processes in a coherent and credible manner.

Its political effectiveness and operational capabilities can and must be further strengthened, developed and enhanced. We see particular potential in the field of preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention. The establishment of the office of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities was a very important step in this respect, and we commend the High Commissioner for the work he has done so far. Some of his activities, such as those carried out in the Baltic States, have been of immediate and direct relevance to the work of the United Nations.

We see great merit in the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century and in the importance given in that document to the protection of the rights of persons belonging to minorities. According to the Declaration, ethnic tensions,

aggressive nationalism and violations of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities are among the main security concerns in the OSCE region. We welcome in this context the emphasis placed by the Declaration on the preventive elements to combat these threats to regional security, and we are of the view that designing ways and means to seek solutions to conflicts among communities living within States could be a positive element in the development of a European security architecture. Liechtenstein is prepared to make a contribution in this field, which should also be a priority for human dimension issues: the promotion and protection of human rights and a steady process of democratization.

In conclusion, we wish to commend the Government of Switzerland for its outstanding work as Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE and to pledge our full support to Denmark as the incoming Chairman-in-Office.

Mr. Jusys (Lithuania): I am honoured to address the General Assembly on agenda item 38, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe". We have associated ourselves with the statement just made by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the European Union. In addition to that statement, allow me to share some thoughts on today's subject.

The continuous review of this item by the General Assembly reflects a growing understanding that the appropriate regional institutions should be mandated with the primary responsibility for outstanding regional issues before they are referred to the United Nations. Such an approach would also streamline the activities of the United Nations. It also allows regional issues to be addressed with precision, speed and the most flexible and cost-effective organizational structures.

The benefits and achievements of improved cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) — utilizing comparative advantages, increasing efficiency and better use of scarce resources — are reflected in the Secretary-General's report. However, there is still room for improvement. We encourage the United Nations Secretary-General to explore all possible ways to further advance United Nations interaction with the OSCE, as a regional arrangement in the sense of the Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

I should like to reiterate our gratitude to Switzerland for its outstanding chairmanship of the OSCE during such an important year for Europe.

We fully endorse the draft resolution introduced by Denmark. It reflects the progress made in this inter-institutional cooperation and notes the adoption in 1996 of the Lisbon Declaration, which is an important step towards a more cooperative European and transatlantic security. We are confident that the OSCE, under the incoming chairmanship of Denmark, will continue to play a central and results-oriented role in the building of a more secure, stable and prosperous Europe, and will be in a better position to contribute to the goals of the United Nations.

The OSCE has a unique mandate and membership. In his address at the Lisbon Summit, the President of the Republic of Lithuania, His Excellency Mr. Algirdas M. Brazauskas, stressed that the OSCE

> "will continue to be a unique forum that unites the States of Europe and maintains important transatlantic relations".

One of its most important features is its inclusive membership of 54 States of Europe, Central Asia and North America. The OSCE's high standards on inter-State relations, regional security, democracy and human rights are applicable to over a third of the world's land surface and extend to nearly one fifth of the world population. Their legitimacy is ensured through the political consensus of the participating States, and they are based on the universal principles of international law and those enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The OSCE promotes the protection of the aforementioned universal principles and serves as an instrument for their implementation at the regional level, including in areas such as Tajikistan, Nagorny Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Moldova, Chechnya and the former Yugoslavia.

One example of this cooperation is the joint action of the United Nations Mission of Observers and the OSCE Mission in Tajikistan, where the United Nations conducted peacekeeping and peacemaking efforts, and the OSCE promoted human rights and democratic institutions. That experience is one on which we can build. Another example is that of Chechnya, where dialogue among the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the OSCE Chairman-in-Office and the Russian Government, whose cooperation has been

commendable, contributed recently to a peaceful settlement. This process has not yet exhausted its full potential. The United Nations High Commissioner should give his valuable support to the OSCE Assistance Group.

Mr. Minoves-Triquell (Andorra), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The OSCE deserves a special tribute for laying the groundwork for democratic institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the United Nations has also been playing a key role in the maintenance of peace and security in the region. The Implementation Force (IFOR), led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), has demonstrated its ability, under new and quickly developing circumstances, to make a crucial contribution to regional peace and stability.

On the one hand, there are many lessons to be learned by international institutions involved in early warning and conflict prevention activities in the former Yugoslavia. On the other hand, there are examples of successful cooperation, including the sharing of expertise in conflict management and post-conflict rehabilitation. The United Nations and the OSCE, in cooperation with other authoritative international institutions, can and should apply their strengths and comparative advantages towards overcoming what at times seem like insurmountable odds, even in instances where a cooperative spirit may be lacking among the conflicting parties, in order to save lives and help rebuild war-ravaged countries.

Almost every European country assisted in the resolution of this conflict. For Lithuania, the soil of the former Yugoslavia was the starting point for our contribution to United Nations peacekeeping operations. It has since increased fourfold. A company-size Lithuanian unit is now deployed north of Tuzla within the Danish battalion, as part of the NATO-led IFOR mission guarding the peace agreed upon in Dayton. We responded to the invitation from the Secretary-General of NATO, Mr. Javier Solana, to be a part of the Stabilization Force (SFOR) from the very beginning. Lithuania has also contributed personnel to the International Police Task Force and to other post-war efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Together with other countries at the international conference held last week in London, we pledged our continuous concrete support to rebuild Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Security issues today are still crucial for a new and united Europe. We have embarked upon creating a Europe with no dividing lines and with security built not at anyone's expense, but rather for everyone's benefit. The principle of the indivisibility of security is one of the foundations of the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century, as adopted at the Lisbon Summit. The success of this new European security architecture will be of global importance — both for maintaining peace and stability on the continent and by serving as a model for the entire world.

In this quest, we emphasize another crucial principle of the OSCE: the right of a State to belong or not to belong to defence treaties or alliances. I would like to repeat the words of my President who said at the Lisbon Summit that there is no alternative to European integration; nor is there any other comparable example of successful voluntary and mutually beneficial cooperation among the peoples of Europe. No one has the right to veto Lithuania's integration into European and transatlantic structures. The right to enter into security arrangements, including treaties or alliance, has been reiterated once again by the leaders of OSCE States in their Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century. Based on these premises, Lithuania is striving for membership in the European Union, the Western European Union and NATO.

Since its birth, NATO has always been the major defender in the region of universal values enshrined in the United Nations Charter and other international legal instruments. NATO membership is an understandable goal of many Eastern European countries. The opening of the alliance eastwards by accommodating the wishes of all those democratic States which seek full membership is a process which contributes to the goals of the OSCE and complements those of the United Nations.

Our vision of mutually reinforcing and interlocking institutions whose aim is to safeguard universal principles and values calls for greater cooperation on a practical level. There are many areas where organizations such as the United Nations and the OSCE could reinforce one another. Although some duplication is natural and unavoidable, it is important

to minimize the unnecessary overlap of activities and to build on each other's strengths and areas of competence.

Thus, we warmly welcome increased contacts between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office and the Secretary-General of OSCE. Similarly, given this blessing from the very top, working-level contacts between the specialized institutions of the United Nations and the OSCE in appropriate areas should be encouraged.

The establishment of good-neighbourly relations through confidence-building between States has been a pillar of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)/OSCE process as well as of Lithuanian foreign policy. Today, OSCE's security dimension is still based on confidence-building measures such as conventional arms control, transparency in arms, information-sharing, the Code of Conduct on Politico-military Aspects of Security, and the mechanisms of the Vienna Document 1994 on confidence and security-building measures. The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) is another confidence-building measure operating as an arms control instrument. Although it applies to a more limited membership, it affects the security of non-parties to the Treaty. For this reason, we feel it is important to involve all States participating in OSCE in discussions and decisions on the adaptation of the CFE Treaty.

The recent adoption of the Framework for Arms Control by the Forum for Security Cooperation, as well as the Forum's determination to complement the international community's efforts to address the issues of anti-personnel landmines and to fight terrorism are practical steps towards a comprehensive disarmament approach. Concurrently, the United Nations is attempting to elaborate universal instruments for confidence-building, such as the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and military expenditure reporting. In extending confidence-building measures to other regions of the world, the United Nations could utilize relevant OSCE experience.

With regard to the information contained in the Secretary-General's report (A/51/480) on regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights and the provisions of the draft resolution on that subject, to be adopted during this General Assembly session, we value steps taken by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Centre for Human Rights with regard to the possibilities for broader utilization of regional arrangements in the field of human rights. Nevertheless, we are convinced that practical cooperation between the United Nations and European regional organizations, in particular the OSCE and the Council of Europe, for the promotion and protection of human rights, should be strengthened.

We fully support the regular exchange of information between the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe on the human rights programmes being carried out by them. We encourage the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to participate in the activities of these organizations when essential issues on the protection of human rights are being considered. Regular consultations among the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights/Centre for Human Rights and the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, and the relevant bodies of the Council of Europe would ensure the submission to the United Nations of comprehensive and objective information on the human rights situation in the region. They would also allow more effective planning of joint undertakings to solve problems.

I would like to encourage the leaders and structures of both organizations to continue the exploration of common goals and the building on respective advantages of each organization, to foster further complementarity and mutually reinforcing efforts, and, where appropriate, to take joint action. We look forward to great progress and success in the year to come.

Mr. Sychou (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): In the past few years, cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has become more active, both at the political and at the organizational levels. This interaction has encompassed spheres such as peacemaking, humanitarian activities, human rights monitoring, the monitoring of elections, the implementation of the sanctions regime and other OSCE mission activities in conflict areas.

The trend towards expanding this type of interaction is logical in view of the growing influence of the OSCE in European affairs, and of its coordinating role in the formation of the future structure of European security. The great potential for coordination between the activities of the United

Nations and the OSCE in ensuring European security and the ability of the OSCE to coordinate its activities with respect to all regional organizations and associations in Europe, including the European Union, the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Western European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and others, were confirmed at the OSCE Summit, which took place in Lisbon at the beginning of December 1996, and in the decisions that were taken there: the political Declaration and statement on the model of European security for the twenty-first century, and other documents. This potential was confirmed by an agreement reached at the Lisbon Summit on adapting the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe - the cornerstone of a future pan-European security system - to the changed military and political conditions in Europe. This agreement also specified directions, limits and time-frames for the updating of that Treaty.

The importance of the role of the OSCE has been strengthened by the fact that the organization provides the most adequate structure for a pan-European dialogue on various issues in order to prevent potential conflicts. The results of the work undertaken by participants in the Lisbon Summit should be considered to be of unquestioned and direct concern for the United Nations, and they should be actively utilized by the United Nations and the Security Council. That is why Belarus attaches such great importance to its part in carrying out measures under the auspices of the OSCE, including bilateral, multilateral and international agreements.

We believe cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE to be important for issues relating to the institutional reform of the OSCE, and we advocate the preparation of a treaty document setting out the new system of security in Europe. Security is universal and multi-faceted in nature; it is comprehensive and indivisible. No single State or group of States can strengthen its security at the expense of others. There should be no spheres of influence or demarcation lines within a common area. The new model for European security developed within the OSCE should be based not on mutual deterrence, but on the concept of cooperation and mutual security guarantees. This will be possible only if we rely, in one form or another, on all international organizations involved in the field of security in Europe: the United Nations, the OSCE, the Council of Europe, NATO as a whole — with its Partnership for Peace programme — the European Union, the Western European Union and the Commonwealth of Independent States. In so doing, the OSCE, acting as an effective instrument to ensure peace, has repeatedly proved, in practice, that it should be given the central coordinating role.

The OSCE played a leading role in overcoming the split on the European continent, and we therefore share the view that building a united Europe should take priority over the integration into NATO of individual countries, at a time when new borders are taking shape on the continent. A new model should be geared towards defining and guaranteeing existing borders in Europe. European security should, as a priority, be universal in nature; that is precisely why the building of a new European architecture can be accomplished only by the OSCE, which includes, on equal terms, the majority of European States, as well as Canada and the United States.

The alarming notes that have been sounded in statements made by many delegations during the present session of the General Assembly are symptomatic. On the eve of the twenty-first century, the world has still not rid itself of certain threats. If, in the context of Europe, global conflict has in general been relegated to the realm of hypothesis rather than of reality, the European continent unfortunately has not been able to rid itself of the tragic and periodically renewed experience of regional conflicts — even in the period following the cold war. From that point of view, the OSCE has worked on effective machinery for settling conflicts and creating an atmosphere of trust between countries. We should support measures to harmonize actions between United Nations missions and the OSCE in relation to Georgia and Tajikistan, emphasizing preventive diplomacy. The signing of a declaration on reconciliation between Germany and the Czech Republic is an important event that should have a positive effect on the future strengthening of European security.

The great importance of questions of arms control as a main means of ensuring security and stability in all continents, especially Europe, has prompted the OSCE to attach great importance to problems relating to the non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, conventional arms and the production of dual-use materials and technologies. Belarus advocates the continued implementation of all treaties on disarmament and arms control and the conclusion of new agreements, including regional ones.

As the Assembly knows, after the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Belarus was the first country in the world voluntarily to reject the possession of nuclear weapons and to proclaim a denuclearization policy. An expression of the commitment of Belarus to these obligations was its ratification of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and the Lisbon Protocol to it; its accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); and its signing of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

It gives me great pleasure to state, from this rostrum, that, in November 1996, before the established deadline, the Republic of Belarus withdrew the remaining two missile units equipped with strategic nuclear weapons from its territory. We must acknowledge, however, that there are certain problems involving compensation for the financing of this operation, which complicated the matter. Through concrete practical actions, which are very important for maintaining the dynamic of the entire process of eliminating nuclear weapons from the world, we have tried to cooperate and make our own contribution to international efforts to establish a stable European security system.

It is clear that our actions fully comply with our words. They also logically develop the initiative of President Lukashenka of Belarus with regard to the creation in Central and Eastern Europe of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. As the Assembly is aware, at the Lisbon Summit Belarus, together with many other interested countries, supported this desire to create in Central and Eastern Europe an area free from nuclear weapons. As a State that has completed the withdrawal of strategic nuclear missiles from its territory, we believe that it is extremely important to make joint efforts to lay the foundations for a firm and peaceful future for Europe.

In a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, dated 30 November 1996, President Lukashenka of Belarus stated:

> "The successful realization of the idea of creating in the centre of Europe a zone free from nuclear weapons could become one of the most effective ways of reducing tension in Europe and in international relations as a whole, removing concern with regard to the planned expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to the statements by some countries of Eastern Europe that they are ready to deploy NATO nuclear weapons on their territory. The idea of creating a nuclear-free zone is an important step towards the strengthening of the international non-proliferation regime, is not in conflict with present-day military and political realities in Europe, and threatens no one's national interests." (*A/51/708, eighth paragraph*)

The implementation of this idea would be in the interests of both the United Nations and the OSCE, as it would promote the process of disarmament, exclude the possibility of the renewal of nuclear confrontation in Europe, consolidate existing nuclear-weapon-free zones, enhance regional security and stability and strengthen trust within Europe. The initiative might also promote a solution to the acute problem of the expansion of NATO. The importance of this issue is clear from reading the documents of the Lisbon Summit.

Increasing recognition is being given to the need to step up the activities of the OSCE in the sphere of economic cooperation. In that context, we propose that thought be given to specific security threats linked to the negative consequences of systemic transformation. The severe disintegration of the system has provoked an acute intensification of the economic, social and political contradictions in transitional societies. To ensure a societal transformation that is as smooth and painless as possible, it is essential to focus the efforts, resources and influence of the United Nations on reducing the part played by existing threats on the European continent.

All this requires the reorganization of the activities of the international organizations. Among the priority tasks facing European cooperation is to determine the principles for a new architecture for European security, in which the OSCE would play a key role and duplication with other structures would be avoided. For our part, we intend to intensify cooperation with the United Nations, OSCE and other European organizations on all questions of democratization and the reform of society.

Mr. Cassar (Malta): Born amid the division of the cold war, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) set unique negotiating parameters. It contributed to the consolidation of an otherwise fragile stability on a continent in which bloc antagonism and ideological confrontation reigned

supreme. Through a process of confidence-building, it developed three distinct but interrelated forums. Negotiations on the security, economic and human dimensions helped establish common ground and were later to yield that precious dividend of cooperation we now enjoy.

The CSCE not only witnessed the collapse of totalitarianism, but also the birth of new States, some under agonizing circumstances. Throughout these turbulent years, the CSCE, and later the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), continued to consolidate achievements and to address emerging threats, aware as it was of the difficulties bound to be encountered in a region that spread from Vancouver east to Vladivostok.

The rapidly evolving dynamic of international relations in our time provides the opportunity and imposes the need to promote and enhance cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE. This was the basis of Malta's proposal at the Helsinki follow-up meeting in 1992 which led to the CSCE Summit in Helsinki, declaring the CSCE a regional arrangement in terms of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

That declaration opened new avenues of cooperation between the two organizations and has since led to a number of important developments. The framework agreement between the United Nations and the OSCE provides the basis for cooperation both at the institutional level and in the field. The time has now come to find a lasting and practical formula. Further discussion on this cooperation requires that we take into account both the specific and complementary roles of the two organizations, as well as their separate and distinct tasks in the contexts in which they operate.

Addressing the Lisbon Summit, my Prime Minister, Dr. Alfred Sant, stressed the need for participating States to redouble their efforts to

> "reach a consensus on the commitment to use OSCE mechanisms as the instruments of first resort in our common effort at preventive diplomacy within the OSCE, without in any way prejudicing the provisions of Article 35 of the Charter of the United Nations".

Just over a week ago, the Heads of State or Government of the States participating in the OSCE adopted the Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century. The model aims to establish a cooperative foundation for common security in order to build a peaceful OSCE region in which all nations and individuals feel secure.

Rather than being disheartened by the turbulence of tension and conflict which have spread through the region in recent years, our Heads of State and Government have again responded to the challenges of change, drawing strength from diversity and inspired by shared values of common security. Their document states:

> "Freedom, democracy and cooperation among nations and peoples are now the foundation of our common security. We are determined to learn from the tragedies of the past and to translate our vision of a cooperative future into reality by creating a common security space free of dividing lines, in which all States are equal partners."

In Lisbon, Malta declared its readiness and preparedness to continue pursuing a policy directed at the attainment of peace, security and stability within the OSCE space. It reiterated the assurance that the use of its territory would be allowed only, and exclusively, for diplomatic and political initiatives aimed to promote peace and stability. Within this comprehensive approach, Malta will be effectively participating in confidence-building that contributes concretely to a reduction of tensions in the Mediterranean and to the strengthening of common security.

Mediterranean security is closely linked to European security and thus also to international peace and security. This concept, which Malta has assiduously promoted since the early 1970s in Helsinki, is now acknowledged as the point of departure for all initiatives of which the final objective is the strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. The twofold objective of Malta's Mediterranean policy is to consolidate the Euro-Mediterranean concept in order to create a more meaningful partnership, complemented by our efforts to strengthen and enhance the OSCE Mediterranean process. My Government remains firmly determined to contribute effectively to all reasonable options that would serve to enhance a Mediterranean identity and commitment to regional cooperation and unity.

Regarding the adoption of the OSCE Lisbon document of 1996, the delegation of Malta made a statement in which it interpreted the paragraph in the Summit Declaration concerning the OSCE's relations with the Mediterranean partners for cooperation and its other partners for cooperation as a commitment and a mandate to continue to develop such relationships. Malta also noted that the current relationships, based on existing CSCE and OSCE documents and decisions, could have been improved upon by a separate decision in Lisbon, and that the relationship between the OSCE and the Mediterranean partners for cooperation might have been upgraded to a permanent one. The delegation of Malta was similarly prepared to consider consolidating and improving the OSCE's relations with Japan, as well as to consider developing on a more permanent basis the organization's relations with the Republic of Korea.

As a follow-up to its initiatives at the Lisbon Summit, in the past days Malta has presented two draft decisions, one at the OSCE's Forum for Security Cooperation and another at the Permanent Council. The latter, if adopted, decides

> "to invite the Mediterranean partners for cooperation and the partners for cooperation to all its plenary meetings and to the appropriate subsidiary meetings as informal observers".

These decisions would give these partners the opportunity to contribute to such meetings on the subjects in which they have a direct interest and/or on which they wish to cooperate actively within the OSCE.

The Mediterranean, with its history of being at the crossroads of cultures and traditions, has also been the stage for innumerable conflicts and wars. This millennial tension has left its mark to the north, south, east and west of this middle sea still beleaguered by numerous political, economic, social, humanitarian and environmental problems. The positive measures, programmes and initiatives being undertaken by the European Union within the Euro-Mediterranean process are noteworthy. It is of paramount importance that the OSCE assume a more direct and enhanced role in this evolving scenario. Commitment to the Mediterranean contributes to peace, stability and social justice for the peoples inhabiting its shores and beyond.

Institution-building has assumed particular importance in the life of the OSCE, particularly with regard to tackling the challenges in regions ravaged by tension and conflict. The recent general elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina are a tribute to the OSCE's efforts and success in contributing to democracy-building and to the consolidation of stability and security. Malta has participated regularly in election monitoring and intends to continue its contribution to this important facet of the OSCE's work.

Throughout these past years of cooperation, the United Nations and the OSCE have shared moments of hope and frustration. Both organizations have witnessed with distress the tears of joy at the consolidation of global peace mingling with the tears of sorrow of the survivors of regional conflict. In this alternating landscape, our determination has never faltered. Difficulties were not always surmountable. Acts of terror by the few in defiance of the rule of law, often overshadowed the efforts of millions to build a better world for present and future generations. Persistent and persevering, our two organizations should continue to consolidate and enhance their cooperation as the threats to security continue to evolve. The security of States is today imperilled not only by the threat or the outbreak of war. Terrorism, organized crime, drug and arms trafficking, uncontrolled migration and environmental damage are of increasing concern to the entire OSCE community. These threatening phenomena that have an impact on the stability of our societies, together with the more conventional forms of military threats to the security of States, underline the need for a lasting and practical formula for enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE.

Finally, allow me to express Malta's appreciation to the Permanent Observer of Switzerland, Ambassador Manz, and to his delegation for Switzerland's excellent work as Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE. Malta looks forward to working closely with Denmark, the incoming Chairman-in-Office.

Mr. Gorelik (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Our consideration of the subject before us today is particularly timely because regional factors are becoming increasingly important in the multi-polar world that has emerged since the cold war. The key question today is how best to combine and link global and regional efforts to strengthen international security and improve the living conditions of people.

The Russian Federation is a consistent advocate of strengthening and improving interaction between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and

Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), which is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. From that standpoint, we commend the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/51/489, and in particular its main conclusion regarding the need to continue to promote cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE.

In our view, the basic areas for partnership between the United Nations and the OSCE should reflect the key priorities of the international community, foremost of which are the settlement of crises through negotiations and peacemaking and humanitarian tasks relating to security and development, including questions of human rights, national minorities, refugees and displaced persons. The nature and concrete forms of the two organizations' interactions should be regulated by the legal norms for cooperation between the United Nations and other international regional organizations, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

Russia actively advocates strengthening the OSCE and expanding its potential as a central institution for security and stability on the European continent. The last year has been marked by tangible progress in this area, although we would have liked to see more. The latest milestone was the decisions of the OSCE Summit in Lisbon, in particular the Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century, adopted on the initiative of Russia. This Declaration reflected the central goals of a common, comprehensive, indivisible security zone free from demarcation lines; security; cooperation between the OSCE and other international organizations to achieve these goals; recognition that no single organization, State or group can bear the predominant responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and stability in the OSCE region; and recognition of the importance of States complying with their obligations regarding national minorities. The decisions taken at Lisbon also set forth the idea of renewing the conceptual basis of a European-wide process, giving it a legal basis, which is to be promoted by the preparation of a charter of European security. Generally speaking, that Summit was instrumental in preparing the OSCE to take on the role of coordinator of the efforts of all European and Euro-Atlantic organizations to ensure European security.

The United Nations should make a significant contribution to the work in building a new structure for European security and architecture. The Organization's political and expert support could be useful in achieving this common European goal. One of the priority areas for interaction between the United Nations and the OSCE should be enhancing the European potential for peacemaking, in particular strengthening its normative basis, including the preparation of a sort of charter for the activities of OSCE peacemaking missions. The United Nations has an interest in enhancing the effectiveness of the OSCE as an instrument of early warning, conflict prevention, crisis regulation, arms control and post-conflict rehabilitation. A more energetic and confident OSCE would reduce the burden of the United Nations in these areas and would supplement its efforts. Joint efforts or a division of labour between the two organizations has clear political advantages. It would be a good idea to help in every possible way to implement the agreements between the United Nations and the OSCE, including the framework agreement of 1993. It is also of great importance to strengthen contacts between the two organizations at various levels, including their high-level structures, secretariats and field missions.

We note with satisfaction the deepening of cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE in regulating conflicts involving the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), in particular in Abkhazia, the Republic of Georgia, and Tajikistan. Russia is actively participating in OSCE efforts to deal with the conflict in Nagorny Karabakh. As co-Chairman with Finland of the Minsk Conference, and with the support of other participants in the Minsk Group, we are continuing efforts to intensify negotiations in that process to find promptly a political agreement. Interaction between the United Nations and the OSCE in these efforts is ongoing. In a matter of days the Security Council will again hear information from the co-Chairmen of the Minsk Conference.

Russia, together with its partners in the CIS, intends to continue this policy of strengthening the peacemaking potential of the CIS in interaction with the United Nations and the OSCE under terms acceptable to both sides. We are convinced of the need for the United Nations and the OSCE to provide the CIS tangible material and financial support for its peacemaking efforts.

Russia commends the important role played by the OSCE in implementing the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly its role in organizing elections for higher governmental offices in Bosnia. It is gratifying that the

OSCE will continue to attach great importance to implementing the Agreement for Peace in Bosnia, and in particular to the holding of municipal elections. We expect the OSCE mission to have a resourceful and impartial approach to the preparations for these elections. However, in our view, the overall responsibilities of the OSCE in this area are significantly broader, encompassing such serious issues as helping establish high standards for the protection of human rights and national minorities and preventing new inter-ethnic clashes, migration flows and refugees. The United Nations, with its extensive experience and capacity in this area, can provide support to OSCE efforts.

Russia intends to continue to help to enhance practical cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE. We hope that the draft resolution before the General Assembly on this issue, of which the Russian Federation is a sponsor, will provide important additional momentum.

Mr. Náthon (Hungary): Hungary, as a member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Troika, has had the opportunity during the past three years to play a particularly honouring role in the organization. During this period, the organization itself has changed a lot. Since the Budapest Summit in 1994, when the Conference obtained its present status as an organization, its agenda has grown, enabling it to face a number of old and new challenges in our region.

After the historic changes in Central and Eastern Europe in the early 1990s, one of the most fundamental tasks was the elaboration of a new approach to security in the region and the creation of a new cooperative security system, the participants of which would be able to enjoy all the benefits of a comprehensive and indivisible security. The shaping of this new system has taken place at a very difficult time, when many countries in the region are facing the hardships of the transition to market economy, with all the unwanted consequences of social and economic problems.

Another serious source of tension is, very regrettably, the great number of ethnic conflicts. In recent years, questions relating to the observance of minority rights have become one of the greatest challenges for the OSCE. Unfortunately, we have several examples in the OSCE region in which, in striking contrast to the aspirations of nations and ethnic communities to seek to promote those rights by democratic and parliamentary means, some have wished to have their intentions recognized by means of violence and arms. These actions have resulted not only in the loss of lives, economic devastation and the poisoning of future generations with hatred, but have also left many people without a home and created hopeless, uprooted refugees. The OSCE is committed to strengthening the stability of the region, contributing to the peaceful settlement of tensions through diplomatic means, helping to remedy the situation in crisis-ravaged areas and facilitating the return, in safety and dignity, of refugees and internally displaced persons in conformity with international standards.

Some days ago at the Lisbon Summit, the Heads of State or Government of the participating States of the organization gathered to take stock of the OSCE's achievements and to set up its future agenda, while assessing the situation in the region. Their Declaration emphasized that the organization should focus on security-related economic, social and environmental issues. To this end, the OSCE should concentrate its efforts and means on identifying the risks to security arising from economic, social and environmental problems, discuss their causes as well as potential consequences and take preventive action, if possible. The Declaration also stressed the importance of the protection of human rights and the strengthening of democratic institutions to further eliminate the possible sources of tension, as well as the necessity of enhancing the organization's conflict-prevention arsenal, with special regard to a reliable early-warning system.

During the past couple of years, there were ample lessons we were forced to learn before being able and ready to set up such priorities. Undoubtedly, the saddest of all was the one taught by the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia and the war in Bosnia that followed. In the wake of the Paris Peace Agreement that brought peace to Bosnia after a long, savage war, the OSCE was entrusted by the international community to take up a major role in the peace-building process. The most important element of these tasks was to organize and monitor the elections in the country. The OSCE performed this role among extremely difficult circumstances. Though we cannot say that these elections were fully free and fair, we are assured that they helped open up the road for the Bosnians towards real democratic values. The Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council recently requested the OSCE to take up a new role in the municipal elections to be held next spring in Bosnia.

The OSCE is ready to contribute to the efforts of the international community to bring peace, stability and prosperity to Bosnia. However, in order to preserve the organization's credibility, we deem it essential that the organization have enough time and all the necessary resources at hand to be able to prepare and organize these municipal elections successfully.

My delegation fully supports draft resolution A/51/L.52 now before us. Hungary has consistently devoted particular attention to the development of cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations and arrangements. We welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to invite regional organizations last February to discuss the possibilities of further enhancing their relationship with the United Nations and to find new and concrete forms for cooperation, as well as to identify those areas of common interest in which this kind of cooperation can produce maximum results.

Undoubtedly, regional organizations have a greater role in international relations than ever before. The world has changed since the United Nations, the only universal Organization, was established. Within the context of the emerging new types of conflict and the diversity of economic, social, humanitarian and environmental problems, a regional organization can act, in many cases, promptly and effectively to detect needs and find appropriate solutions. On the other hand, the international community can make good use of the specific experiences, capacities and resources of these regional organizations while dealing with regional and local conflicts. We should emphasize that this kind of division of labour can spare both financial and valuable human resources, which can be used more effectively to meet other needs.

The constructive working relationship between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe has already attested to the advantages of an international division of labour. There is room for further strengthening the existing partnership, since a broad spectrum of possibilities has yet to be exploited. The two organizations should make better use of their comparative advantages and complementary features and have a more effective coordination to avoid unnecessary duplications.

Bearing in mind the objectives of the United Nations and of OSCE, it is obvious that the most important field for their cooperation is the maintenance of peace and security in our region. The United Nations and OSCE have the same commitments to promoting confidence to avoid conflicts. To this end, the further elaboration of common early-warning systems, joint efforts in preventive diplomacy and post-conflict peace-building are areas at which our future efforts should be aimed. Monitoring human rights and coordination in the field of the safe return of refugees and displaced persons also give ample opportunity for cooperation.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to the Permanent Observer and the delegation of the mission of Switzerland, representing the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, for their devoted and efficient work during the whole year. I also wish much success to the delegation of Denmark, which will be assuming the chairmanship for 1997. Lastly, I would like to welcome the delegation of Poland as the incoming member of the Troika, to whom we proudly pass the torch.

Mr. Kulla (Albania): The General Assembly is considering agenda item 38 just a few days after the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Lisbon Summit in early December. The documents that were adopted, such as the Summit Declaration, the decisions and in particular the valuable results achieved by OSCE on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century are very important for our continent.

Albania was admitted as a full member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe only five years ago. Since that time, tremendous changes have occurred in Albania, Europe and all over the world. The end of the cold war and the spread of democracy opened a new era in the world, especially in Eastern and Central Europe. Of course, these rapid and positive changes have been accompanied by a lot of new problems and challenges, which need to be addressed by the individual States and international organizations.

Our common goal is to ensure that, while keeping and promoting this positive trend, we are vigilant and active in order to contribute together to the maintenance of peace, the establishment and consolidation of democratic societies based on the rule of law and respect for human and minority rights, social development and the promotion of international

cooperation. In this regard, cooperation between OSCE and the United Nations is particularly important.

The Albanian delegation is of the view that current and future challenges cannot be successfully faced without an active role for regional organizations, such as OSCE. It is a fact that regional organizations are an important integral part of international instruments for promoting peace and security, cooperation and development. The past and present of the European continent prove the many links between regional and international security.

Experience to date shows that OSCE is making an increased contribution to maintaining peace and security and promoting cooperation and development in the OSCE area. This has been based on activities related to early warning and preventive diplomacy, including the activities of the High Commissioner on National Minorities, crisis management, arms control and disarmament, post-crisis stabilization and rehabilitation measures and efforts to support economic and human dimensions.

Albania welcomes OSCE and United Nations activities in crisis areas, such as Tajikistan, Nagorny Karabakh and Georgia. We have actively participated in supporting the OSCE and the United Nations in their common efforts to stabilize these crisis zones and restore peace and stability. We will remain fully committed to continuing this policy in the future.

The events of recent years have been pivotal for OSCE and the United Nations in the Balkans. The ethnic tensions that, incredibly, culminated in the crisis in the former Yugoslavia required both organizations to be present and to play a role. Cooperation between OSCE and the United Nations played a fundamental role in Croatia and in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In particular, the closer cooperation between OSCE and the United Nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been and remains very important. In the framework of the Dayton Accords, OSCE played a positive role in the elections of 14 September 1996 and is continuing to do so in the preparations of local elections. Cooperation between both organizations will also be important with regard to future activities aimed at monitoring human rights, establishing democratic State institutions, supporting the Human Rights Commission of Bosnia and Herzegovina, taking confidence-building and security-building measures and promoting the negotiating process on subregional arms control.

The Albanian State and all Albanians living in their own land in the Balkans welcomed the Dayton Accords, since we are driven by the sincere wish that peace and stability may prevail in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We also appreciate what has been achieved so far. But Albania is of the view that the Dayton Accords could not be responsible for solving the Balkan crisis as a whole. This Agreement put an end to the war provoked by the primitive idea of a "Greater Serbia", but peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and even in the whole region, is still at a crossroads. This is due, first of all, to the fact that people cannot go back to the homes from which they were barbarously expelled.

Second, peace in the Balkans is not at stake only because of the Bosnia issue. The question of Kosovo is still one of the most serious issues influencing the maintenance of peace and security in the Balkans. All OSCE member States already know that the Belgrade authorities refused the OSCE mission in Kosovo, in defiance of the resolutions the organizations had passed on this matter. On the other hand, all United Nations Member States are aware of the resolutions adopted by the Organization on the situation in Kosovo. We sincerely appreciate the stand taken by these two outstanding organizations on the question of Kosovo.

My Government thinks that the time has come for the question of Kosovo to take priority in all initiatives and developments relating to the Balkan peninsula. In a recent speech to the OSCE Lisbon Summit, the President of the Republic of Albania said:

> "Two million Albanians are the most recent inhabitants of this continent to experience violence, repression and a police regime. With their peaceful attitude, they have made a valuable contribution to avoiding conflict in the southern Balkan peninsula and beyond."

But the situation in Kosovo still strongly calls for action and sounds a real alarm for the international community in terms of its serious commitment to preventing conflict and finding a just solution to the question of Kosovo.

The Acting President: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/5 of 13 October 1993, I now call on the Secretary-General of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, His Excellency Mr. Giancarlo Aragona.

Mr. Aragona (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe): As was reflected in the statement of Ambassador Manz, the representative of the Swiss Chairman-in-Office, the greatest challenge for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in 1996 was its involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The general elections took place there on 14 September and progress has been made in democracy-building projects and in the implementation of arms-control and confidence- and security-building measures. Recently, the Mission's mandate was extended until the end of 1997.

The Lisbon Summit Declaration of 3 December confirms that OSCE will continue to play an important role in the promotion and consolidation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Having secured the support of the parties, and following the guidance of the Peace Implementation Council, which met last week in London, OSCE will supervise the preparation and conduct of the municipal elections as early as is feasible in 1997. The organization will also continue to assist in the implementation of the other tasks mandated to it under the Dayton Accords.

Our work in Bosnia, as in other areas such as Chechnya, has clearly demonstrated the flexibility and resourcefulness that allow regional arrangements like OSCE to deal effectively with the types of challenges that confront us in the post-cold-war environment. This is acknowledged in the Lisbon document.

The Lisbon document contains a Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-first Century. As other speakers have recalled, it is an expression of the endeavour by participating States to strengthen security and stability in the OSCE region. Its central philosophy is that security is comprehensive and indivisible and that shared values are constitutive elements of a stable security environment. Confirming OSCE as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, the Declaration encourages OSCE to serve as a forum to enhance cooperation and complementarity among European and transatlantic organizations.

The report by the United Nations Secretary-General notes that the idea of promoting greater inter-institutional cooperation is already in evidence in many areas where OSCE and the United Nations share common interests.

Significantly, the Lisbon Declaration states that

> "in exceptional circumstances, the participating States may jointly decide to refer a matter to the United Nations Security Council on behalf of OSCE whenever, in their judgement, action by the Security Council may be required under the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations."

The tripartite consultations between the United Nations, the OSCE and the Council of Europe are bearing fruit and we shall have the next round of consultations in Geneva on 24 January 1997. We are also promoting the principle of a pragmatic rationalization of activities in the field to maximize the use of resources. As a concrete example, I would mention that the United Nations Centre for Human Rights at Geneva and OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights at Warsaw maintain close contacts on matters relating to the human dimension. At Lisbon, the participating States highlighted the importance of the implementation of OSCE human-dimension commitments, particularly in the field of the media, where the appointment of an OSCE representative on freedom of media is now foreseen.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe continues to support OSCE economic-dimension priorities in an efficient and cost-effective way. Perspectives in this field will improve, since the Lisbon Declaration strengthens the role of OSCE by planning for the establishment of a coordinator on economic and environmental activities.

The Lisbon Declaration reiterated the importance of facilitating the return in safety and in dignity of refugees and internally displaced persons in accordance with international standards. We look forward to continued cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in making this possible.

OSCE, particularly through its missions, also works closely with the United Nations Development Programme on a number of projects in Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Moldova, Ukraine and in Central Asia. Missions are one area in which there is potential for coordinated action. The adoption of United Nations Security Council resolution 1077 (1996), which dealt in part with the establishment of a human rights office at Sukhumi, Georgia, with which OSCE will have a close association, has opened up possibilities for concrete

cooperation between our organizations there. A memorandum of understanding is now being finalized to second an OSCE expert to the Sukhumi office.

OSCE feels confident that it can take a leading role in preventive diplomacy in the Vancouver-to-Vladivostock area, for it now has several well-established permanent structures, such as the Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Cooperation, that offer a unique platform for early consultati ٦. I feel comforted by the expressions of support I have heard this morning and I thank those who expressed them.

Consultations on arms control are an important element of OSCE's work. At Lisbon, the participating States agreed to create a framework for arms control with a view to putting in place a web of interlocking and mutually reinforcing arms-control obligations and commitments. That framework is designed to link past, present and future arms control in a comprehensive frame and can establish a flexible agenda for the future by reinforcing the long-held tenets of transparency, mutual reassurance and confidence-building.

Still with regard to arms control, OSCE participating States signatories of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) decided at Lisbon to begin negotiations in early 1997 with a view to adapting the Treaty to the changing security environment in Europe.

OSCE is sensitive to the changes in that security environment. The High Commissioner on National Minorities is a proven instrument of preventive diplomacy in addressing national minority issues at an early stage. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights has introduced a wide range of democracy-building projects and plays an increasingly active role in election observation. The Parliamentary Assembly, in addition to its established position as a forum for OSCE parliamentarians, is playing an increasingly active role in election observation and in generating ideas for the future development of many aspects of OSCE's work.

OSCE missions play an important role in those OSCE countries in which they are deployed. A new mission was established in the Republic of Croatia in April of this year to assist the Croatian authorities in the field of protection of the human rights of persons belonging to national minorities. That brings the current number of OSCE field missions to 10, in addition to the Assistance Group in Chechnya.

In conclusion, OSCE has further developed its potential to act as a mechanism for preventive diplomacy, conflict settlement and post-conflict rehabilitation. Building on the progress already made during the Swiss chairmanship, the Secretariat at Vienna will also continue to provide its support next year during the forthcoming Danish chairmanship to increase cooperation and coordination with the United Nations.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I call on the representative of Armenia on a point of order.

Mr. Abelian (Armenia): My delegation would like to make a motion of no-action, under rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, on the proposed amendment submitted by the Azerbaijani delegation, contained in document A/51/L.54, to the draft resolution entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe", for the following reasons.

The common interpretations and definitions used by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) are based on the decisions taken by consensus by OSCE member States during meetings at various levels, namely, OSCE Summits, Council of Ministers and Senior Council/Committee of Senior Officials, among others. They express the common position of all member States of OSCE and are based on an awareness of the necessity to guarantee balance and objectivity in the mediation efforts of the OSCE Minsk Group. Based on such an approach, the OSCE Lisbon Summit, held on 2 and 3 December 1996, did not include in its final Declaration any paragraph on the Nagorny Karabakh conflict. It is precisely for that reason that the 39 sponsors did not find it appropriate to include the Azerbaijani proposed amendment in the draft resolution.

The delegation of Armenia fully supports the draft resolution entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe", contained in document A/51/L.52. We regret to state that Azerbaijan has failed to take into account the aforementioned

arguments. The delegation of Armenia disassociates itself from any language which contradicts the decisions agreed upon by consensus among the members of OSCE.

Therefore, Armenia would like to make a motion of no-action and calls upon members to give their positive vote to the proposed motion.

The Acting President: The representative of Armenia has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on the amendment contained in document A/51/L.54. Rule 74 reads as follows:

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

Does any member wish to speak?

Mr. Kouliev (Azerbaijan) *(interpretation from Russian)*: We are against the procedural motion on no action proposed by the delegation of Armenia. As a State Member of the United Nations, Azerbaijan should not be deprived of its legitimate right to protect its interests.

Azerbaijan did not and does not make claim to anybody else's territory, but it will not allow any infringement of its own territory.

We call on Member States to vote against the motion of no action proposed by Armenia.

Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina): As we understand it, and as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution as a whole, this amendment was part of previous consensus resolutions.

Problems such as the one that is persisting in Azerbaijan should be resolved consistent with the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States within whose borders the issue arises. From our own experience, we cannot endorse solutions based upon the acceptance of ethnic divisions. We are ourselves beneficiaries of cooperation between the Organization for Security and Coopération in Europe (OSCE), the United Nations and other relevant multilateral organizations.

Finally, we believe that, in this matter, we should have the support of Azerbaijan, the country most directly affected by this conflict. In this context, we support the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in the region — of course, including Azerbaijan and Armenia — as well as a resolution of this problem based on the appropriate highest level of self-rule.

Once again, we in Bosnia and Herzegovina have first-hand experience of such a solution. We would urge Member States to reject the no-action motion and to proceed to a vote on the amendment.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote the motion submitted by the representative of Armenia that no action be taken on the amendment circulated in document A/51/L.54.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Armenia, Nicaragua

Against:
Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chile, Comoros, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Mozambique, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:
Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia

(Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The motion was rejected by 38 votes to 2, with 106 abstentions.

The Acting President: We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/51/L.52 and the amendment thereto, contained in document A/51/L.54.

I shall now call on those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Campbell (Ireland): The European Union regrets that no consensus has been possible on this draft resolution.

This draft resolution is one of a series of technical, almost procedural, resolutions that deal with cooperation between the United Nations and a variety of international organizations. It has been the practice of the General Assembly to adopt these resolutions by consensus and to refrain from introducing contentious issues of substance on which there is no agreement and which may result in a divisive vote.

It is therefore a matter of regret to the European Union and, I believe, to the vast majority of the members of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), that on this occasion and on a draft resolution that deals with an international organization with which the United Nations has established very considerable, effective and worthwhile cooperation, it has been necessary to call for a vote.

Turning briefly to the substance of the issue referred to in the amendment that has been put forward by the Republic of Azerbaijan, the OSCE has established a mechanism agreed by all the parties within which to negotiate on the issue of Nagorny Karabakh. The OSCE Minsk Group, ably co-chaired by Finland and the Russian Federation, is the appropriate forum for detailed consideration of this issue.

The European Union has made clear its support for the principles outlined by the Chairman-in-Office and the Co-Chairmen of the Minsk Group for the settlement of this issue. These are the territorial integrity of the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Azerbaijan; the legal status of Nagorny Karabakh as defined in an agreement based on self-determination that confers on Nagorny Karabakh the highest degree of self-rule within Azerbaijan; and guaranteed security for Nagorny Karabakh and its whole population, including mutual obligations to ensure compliance by all the parties with the provisions of the settlement.

The European Union regrets that no substantial progress has been achieved in reaching a political settlement and has appealed to the parties to continue the negotiations within the Minsk process on the basis of the principles to which I have just referred.

In the view of the European Union, the outcome of the voting that will take place on this amendment, and on which consensus cannot be expected, will be to the advantage of neither party. For these reasons, the member States of the European Union will abstain on this amendment, as we did on the no-action motion.

Mr. Breitenstein (Finland): The position of my delegation has been reflected in the explanation of vote just made by the presidency of the European Union. We have voted and shall vote accordingly. However, as Finland is the Co-Chairman of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Minsk conference until the end of this year, I wish to make the following additional comments in explanation of our vote.

Let me first reiterate that Finland fully supports the statement that the OSCE Chairman-in-Office made in Lisbon on 3 December as well as the principles outlined in the statement for the settlement of the Nagorny Karabakh conflict.

We hope that a political settlement will be achieved on the basis of the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, in particular the principles of territorial

integrity of States and equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

As the outgoing Co-Chairman of the Minsk conference, Finland wants to emphasize that a political settlement is possible only if the parties are ready to compromise. A fundamental prerequisite to the resolution of any conflict is that the parties must be able to live with whatever is agreed. We regret that it is not possible to adopt the draft resolution on cooperation between the OSCE and the United Nations by consensus because of the lack of willingness to compromise. In our view, disputed elements should not be included in these types of draft resolutions, which are traditionally adopted by consensus.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/51/L.52 and on the amendment thereto, contained in document A/51/L.54.

In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the amendment is voted on first. The Assembly shall therefore first take a decision on the amendment circulated in document A/51/L.54.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, China, Croatia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Yemen

Against:

Armenia

Abstaining:

Albania, Andofra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The amendment was adopted by 43 votes to 1, with 103 abstentions.

The Acting President: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/51/L.52, as amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica,

Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of merica, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nepal, Papua New Guinea

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 158 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 51/57).

The Acting President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to move statements in explanation of vote. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): Egypt voted against the no-action motion, proposed by Armenia, on the amendment contained in document A/51/L.54, due to its firm belief that every Member State has the right to present proposals and amendments with regard to any draft resolution or draft decision under consideration; these should be voted on in accordance with their substantive merit. On the substance of the amendment, despite the fact that the Lisbon Declaration did not include a similar paragraph, Egypt voted in favour of the amendment because the language proposed is a slightly modified version of the language of paragraph 8 of resolution 49/13, on the same item, adopted by consensus in 1994.

We firmly believe that the Minsk Conference is the appropriate forum for substantive consideration of this particular question, and would have hoped that that fact would have facilitated reaching consensus on the draft resolution as a whole, which would have better reflected the status of cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr. Gorelik (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation regrets that intensive consultations were not held with all delegations and that the traditional consensus nature of General Assembly resolutions on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) was not maintained.

We hope that today's vote on this resolution will not create an undesirable precedent for the future. The Russian delegation supported the amendment (A/51/L.54) submitted by the delegation of Azerbaijan, because its text relies on the relevant provisions of resolution 49/13, which was adopted by consensus. It also reflects one of the main principles for the settlement in Nagorny Karabakh, confirmed by the OSCE at the Lisbon Summit. These are also principles that the Russian Federation, as a co-Chairman of the Minsk Conference, fully endorses. We therefore abstained in the vote on Armenia's procedural motion that no action be taken on the amendment submitted by Azerbaijan.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 38?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 7

Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations

Note by the Secretary-General (A/51/521)

The Acting President: As members are aware, in accordance with the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and with the consent of the Security Council, the Secretary-General is mandated to notify the General Assembly of matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security that are being dealt with by the Security Council and of matters with which the Council has ceased to deal.

In that connection, the General Assembly has before it a note by the Secretary-General issued as document A/51/521.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of that document?

It was so decided.

Programme of work

The Acting President: Discussion of agenda item 56, entitled "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina", originally scheduled for tomorrow afternoon, Friday, 13 December, is postponed until next week. On Friday, 13 December, in the afternoon, in addition to the items already scheduled for that meeting as announced in today's *Journal*, the General Assembly will also take up agenda item 17 (c), entitled "Election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme", as well as the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 12, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council"; agenda item 123 (a), entitled "United Nations Disengagement Observer Force"; agenda item 123 (b), entitled "United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon"; and on agenda item 125 (a), entitled "United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission".

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.